

years of age. But it was defeated, and instead we got the far more limited benefits of the Kerr-Mills provisions.

The name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] appeared again in the 87th Congress linked with the name of Congressman CECIL R. KING in the King-Anderson bill of that year. The outlines of what we now have were beginning to appear more clearly, but in this and the succeeding King-Anderson bills the proposals kept pushing further toward the more comprehensive provisions which we have today. Then, in the 87th Congress, the proposal would have given 90 days of hospital care with a minimum deductible of \$20 and a maximum of \$10 per day for the first 9 days. The nursing home care proposal was there, and the home health services. The outpatient diagnostic service was there. The idea of a larger tax base was there, and the soundly managed increase in the payroll tax rate to give an actuarially responsible foundation for the benefits.

In the years since then, King-Anderson has been virtually synonymous with the popular term "medicare." But not many will take the trouble to compare Senator ANDERSON's original concept with what we have obtained here and see that the hospital, nursing home, home care, and diagnostic features—the basic features of the hospital protection we are now giving—have been not at all in their major bulk and remarkably little in detail. As a supporter of the King-Anderson proposals at every stage of the way since my arrival in the Senate, I want to say that Senator ANDERSON deserves not only the greatest degree of recognition which can be afforded for his tireless and finally victorious fight, but that the elderly of this year of 1965 and of the future decades will be everlastingly in his debt.

In the enactment of the present bill, there are other Senators who have labored long and hard to achieve the result now before us. Senator LONG, both in the Finance Committee and as floor manager of the bill, has been another ardent champion of the cause. The great concern of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for the best possible benefits we could provide is well known to all of us, and I am proud that I have been able to work so closely with him on some of the features which will now, perhaps sometimes with modification, be a part of the bill.

The provision about which I feel most deeply relates to long-term illness and was the concept or proposal sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. He fought for that, knowing full well that he would ultimately have to take the leadership of the bill. He understood that the real danger in the future would not be the short-term illness but the long-term, terminal cases of cancer and of stroke, and also the long-term accident cases, such as broken hips. Cases which last for 3 months or 100 days in a nursing home are covered in the bill; but it was the cases lasting 6 months or a year, or 5 years or 10 years, that were of real concern.

The Senator from Louisiana was willing to put aside his personal responsibilities and his own personal feelings for the larger benefit to be obtained. He took the forward step in pointing to the 100-day cases and then was willing to join others who believed that we must proceed further.

Improvements have been made by providing 30 additional days for hospital care, to make the total 90 days, and also by including an amendment to provide for additional hospital care, amendments which I had the pleasure to offer in the Committee on Finance.

I am sorry that the Senator from Louisiana did not vote for them. I am disappointed that he did not accept the proposal for complete future care for the long-term illness cases, for the catastrophic illness cases, requiring long periods of recovery.

However, I do not feel that any of us would want to forego the accomplishments which have been made.

Another disappointment is the failure of the conferees to accept more of the amendment relating to aid for the blind, an amendment which was adopted by an overwhelming vote in the Senate. In this instance, it was the responsibility of the Senator from Louisiana to take the floor in opposition to that amendment.

In his heart—I know; I have talked with him—he felt that it should be adopted, but he believed he had a responsibility beyond that to the blind, and that was to protect the integrity of the bill and make it possible to have a bill that could be adopted in conference. I salute him and congratulate him upon that achievement.

Of great assistance in the passage of the bill were the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who was a strong leader and should be complimented; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and other Senators who are members of the Committee on Finance, all of whom were most constructive in working for the best bill that could be obtained. I pay my compliments to the staff of the committee for their diligent work.

Senators outside the committee have also taken a deep interest and have done all they were able to do in support of the improvement of the legislation. I know that they have shared my own concern, and it is a great source of pride to me that my own efforts, coupled with and supported by those of others, have led to the inclusion of many desirable changes in the conference report.

After the conference report has been agreed to, I shall make further remarks concerning my apprehensions for the future; but in the interest of time now, I compliment the President, the Senate, and the Members of the House for this forward step in the enactment of legislation that has been so long awaited.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Indiana. He is quite correct in paying tribute to our colleagues who have made so vast a contribution to the legislation. It has been a great

honor to work with them, especially with the Senator from Indiana, who was a strong supporter of the bill. A number of important amendments were offered by him and his support made possible their inclusion in the bill.

I regret that it was not possible to prevail with more of the amendments of the Senator from Indiana, especially the amendment with respect to assistance to the blind. The Senator knows that I did not support that amendment on the floor of the Senate; but when the Senate agreed to it, I supported it in conference. I sought to bring back from conference as much of the amendment as was possible. We brought back two good amendments, which should be fore-runners of better things to come, both for disabled persons generally and for the blind in particular.

The Senator from Indiana will find as he presses for his amendment that, if he does not get all of it, he will get more in the next session, and more in the sessions following that. Eventually, he will have prevailed on most of the amendment, if not all of it.

I share the Senator's strong feeling that persons suffering long illnesses—the catastrophic cases—should be protected. It is an oversight that such is not the case, but we did our best, both in the Senate and in conference, to prevail in providing the longest term of protection possible for the small percentage of people who need help the most. I look forward to working with the Senator from Indiana in the years ahead to make certain that this group of persons is cared for. I have no doubt that we shall make progress, if not in this Congress, then in the next Congress in providing this important relief.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. We shall work together for future improvements in the act. This is not the last day; it is the first day.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first, the adoption of the conference report will mark a historic occasion in medicare and an improved social security law. I was privileged to serve as one of the conferees of the Senate in the conference with the House. As is always the case, it is necessary to compromise the differences between the bill the Senate passes and the bill the House passes.

The Senate did not get everything it wanted, but we came out of conference with a workable, practical, sensible, digestible type of bill. It is a measure that preserves the free practice of medicine and in no way impairs doctor-patient relationships. In the years ahead, changes will understandably be needed. When they become necessary, amendments to the act will be proposed, and will be made. But it is necessary to walk before one can run. That was the general attitude of most of the conferees, certainly the conferees on the part of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats alike as it was also the attitude of the conferees on the part of the House.

July 28, 1965

Probably this bill might be compared, in its long-range effects, with the original Social Security Act of 1935. All who have had a part in drafting the legislation and in supporting it—certainly those who took part in the conference—deserve special credit and may well be proud that they were able to play so important a part in what all of us have described as historic legislation. The measure as it goes to the President for signature provides for an effective and adequate medical care program for our senior citizens. I urge the adoption of the conference report.

APPOINTMENT OF ABE FORTAS TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. BASS. The time is under control.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it was with both pride and personal pleasure that I listened to the announcement by President Johnson that he was sending to the Senate today the nomination of Abe Fortas to be a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

A Tennessean, Mr. Fortas has climbed the ladder with diligence, ability, and integrity. He is renowned as a lawyer; he is a known as a patriot; he is recognized as unselfish in his willingness to contribute of his substance to the public good. He will bring to the Court an ability, a compassion, an understanding, and a wisdom possessed by only a small minority of men.

I am particularly elated in a personal way because Abe Fortas and I have been personal friends for a quarter of a century. I am delighted with this appointment. I applaud President Johnson in the choice.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the senior Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I join my senior colleague in the view that he has just expressed on the appointment by President Johnson of a distinguished Tennessean, an able lawyer, and an outstanding American to the Supreme Court of the United States.

I feel quite certain that in time Mr. Fortas will prove to the Nation and to the world what an important, right decision the President made in this particular case. I commend President Johnson for his choice of this distinguished American and Tennessean.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield time to me?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing great appreciation for the President's appointment of Mr. Fortas.

I know him very well. He is one of the most distinguished lawyers in the Nation.

He will, in a very admirable way, fill the big shoes of those who preceded him, including Mr. Justice Goldberg, now our Ambassador to the United Nations.

I shall have the privilege of considering the nomination of Mr. Fortas to be a member of the U.S. Supreme Court when the Committee on the Judiciary considers his nomination.

It gives me great satisfaction to learn he has been nominated for this high post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM—THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT TO THE NATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have just heard the statement of the President explaining the policies and plans of the United States with respect to the situation in Vietnam.

All of us are conscious of the heavy burden the President bears, and I want to speak with understanding and helpfulness.

Without retreating from the commitment of the United States, he spoke with restraint.

The statement of the President that he was not declaring a national emergency and that he would not call up the Reserves indicates that the President wants the world to know that the United States does not intend that our troops shall undertake the primary responsibility of South Vietnam to defend itself, and that our country will continue to exercise restraint against the expansion of action into a major war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hope the statement of the President will mark a turn for good in Vietnam.

I hope very much that, recognizing that the present situation holds the possibility of a major war, the President will, at the appropriate time, submit the question of Vietnam to the United Nations to ascertain if the U.N. will undertake to bring about a settlement, and avoid a great war with all its awesome possibilities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, have had a desire to make a statement with regard to the message of the President.

I am honored to have been preceded by so distinguished a colleague as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. In my judgment, the President made a restrained and considered, while resolute, address to the Nation.

The idea of again seeking to invoke the good offices and the assistance of the United Nations in this matter through our new Ambassador to the United Nations is most admirable. It should be

approved and applauded by the entire Nation and the world.

The President has made it clear that the two principal Cabinet officers will be available for consultation with congressional committees and Members of Congress. This is also an excellent idea.

I believe that it is advisable to pursue such a course of action. However, the President has made it very clear that we are in South Vietnam to stay; and the erosion not of the will, but of the ability of the South Vietnamese themselves to resist has caused an important accretion to the troop strength and may cause even further accretion of troop strength as the days go on.

The President made it very clear that we are exercising much restraint now in not calling up the reserves and in having a moderately low increase of our troop strength. We must not expect that to be the order of magnitude for the future.

It is for those reasons that I continue to urge the President to seek a new congressional resolution of support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a congressional resolution of support would be the best way in which to consolidate the Nation in its resoluteness on Vietnam and give the Nation reassurance as to the size and nature of our likely commitment there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join in the comments that have been made on the speech just delivered by the President of the United States and the press conference which followed thereafter.

In my opinion the speech was delivered in low key, in a calm and in a deliberately measured manner, in so doing, the President tendered both the arrow and the olive branch.

So far as consultation with Congress is concerned, I know of no President who has ever consulted more with Congress than has Lyndon B. Johnson. So far as I am concerned, speaking personally, I was one of a group which met with the President three times within the past 24 hours. I mention this only to emphasize the amount of time he spends with the Congress for counsel and advice. May I say that these discussions are on a give and take basis and everyone is free to express his opinions, whatever they may be.

Yesterday morning the question of Vietnam policy was discussed with the Democratic leadership. Last evening for 2 hours and 10 minutes it was discussed with the bipartisan leadership of both Houses. For more than an hour and a half this morning the situation was discussed with members of the appropriate

committees from both Houses of Congress—the Committees on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committees on Armed Services.

The President is to be commended for the speech he made. I know of no one who is more interested personally in what is happening in Vietnam, no one who is more desirous of seeking an honorable settlement to a situation which is fraught with difficulties and imponderables.

The President has endeavored, as he has indicated, time and time again, to go down any path, anywhere, any place, including the United Nations which might lead to peace. His latest instructions to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg have been to contact all sources within, without, and around the United Nations to the end that this dispute, if at all possible, can be brought to an honorable conclusion.

I commend the President. I know how much he is immersed in this matter personally. I know of the hours that he spends on the problem. I know how it preys on his thinking. I know it is uppermost in his mind. He is open to suggestions from all sources. He is doing his very best; and that is all that any one man can do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, President Johnson's message to the Nation concerning the situation in Vietnam and its implications for America, will, I am certain, be remembered by history as one of the truly great speeches made by an American President.

Rather than attempting to allay popular fears by minimizing the situation in Vietnam, the President dealt in a completely forthright manner with its dangers and its difficulties.

Instead of despair over the repeated demonstrations of intransigence by Hanoi and Peking, the President again reiterated our willingness to meet with any government at any time or to take advantage of the initiative of any nation or of the United Nations, in seeking a peaceful and honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

But perhaps above everything else, the President's statement will be recalled for the remarkable clarity and logic with which he restated the reasons for our presence in Vietnam and for our determination not to yield to Communist aggression.

President Johnson spoke for America. And I am certain that his speech will enjoy the support and the applause of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program

and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, H.R. 6675 is a monumental measure of far-reaching consequences.

It deals with fundamental human needs of millions of Americans.

It extends a helping hand not only to our senior citizens, but also to children, blind, and disabled persons, and needy individuals.

There is general agreement on the humanitarian objectives of this bill although many differ regarding the methods of achieving these objectives, particularly in the field of medical care for the aged.

BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF PROVISIONS

H.R. 6675 has four main parts.

First. In the area of medical care, it provides as follows:

(a) A compulsory hospital-nursing home plan for most persons past 65 financed by, first, higher social security taxes on workers, their employers, and the self-employed and by, second, payments elderly patients must make toward their care—deductibles and daily charges.

(b) A voluntary supplementary plan covering physicians' services and certain other health costs financed by first, monthly premiums paid by those past 65, by second, matching premiums paid by the Federal Government out of general revenues, and by third, fees patients must pay for care—deductibles plus 20 percent of remaining costs.

(c) An expanded Kerr-Mills medical assistance program for the needy and medically needy aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children. This combines five existing medical assistance programs into a single program.

Second. H.R. 6675 provides expanded services for maternal and child health, crippled children, child welfare, and the mentally retarded and establishes a 5-year program of special project grants for comprehensive health care and services for needy children—including those emotionally disturbed of school age or preschool age.

Third. H.R. 6675 provides greater benefits and coverage under social security old-age, survivors, and disability programs, including a 7-percent increase in monthly benefits for social security recipients with a \$4 minimum increase for an individual and a \$6 minimum increase for a couple.

Fourth. H.R. 6675 improves and enlarges public assistance programs.

From this brief description, the scope and breadth of this legislation are merely indicated. I shall not attempt at this point to describe the bill in full, for it is a very comprehensive, very technical bill totaling 387 pages. More details can be found elsewhere in my statement.

SOCIAL SECURITY BILL WILL BECOME LAW

It is very apparent that H.R. 6675 will become the law of the land—and most

of the programs, including the new basic hospital insurance plan and the supplementary insurance plan for medical care of Americans past 65, will become permanent programs.

In a far-reaching bill of this complexity and nature, no one is completely satisfied with every provision. I have consistently fought for comprehensive medical care for any aged person who needs assistance in paying his medical bills, with such a program to be financed out of general revenues. Although this bill in part relies on general revenues, the basic hospital-nursing home plan relies on social security taxes and makes limited benefits available to everyone regardless of need.

This legislation has been developed according to established congressional procedure, with all Americans allowed an opportunity to present their views. In particular, the subject of medical care for the aged has been investigated, studied, and debated for a number of years, quite intensively during the past 5 years.

Now the majority in Congress has worked its will and, in the American way, everyone accepts that.

It now behooves all of us to do our best to make these programs as workable and as effective as possible.

Let us put acrimony behind us. Let us bind up our wounds and with malice toward none let us get on with the enormous job of implementing this measure.

LANDMARK LEGISLATION

The inauguration of the basic hospital insurance program and the supplementary insurance program will be hailed as landmark legislation, as indeed it is.

It will unquestionably be important in helping our senior citizens meet their hospital, doctor, and certain other medical expenses.

It is estimated the basic and supplementary plan together will cover just under 50 percent of the average medical costs of those past 65.

Nevertheless, we all have a duty not to oversell these programs. We should not lead those past 65 to believe more is provided than actually is provided.

BILL DOES NOT COVER ALL MEDICAL NEEDS

For example, H.R. 6675 does not provide aid for every kind of medical care an individual past 65 may need.

The basic plan for instance does not pay for private rooms, private nurses, long-term stays in psychiatric hospitals or drugs outside a hospital; nor does it cover very long catastrophic illness.

The supplemental plan does not cover routine physicals, extensive psychiatric care, routine dental work, drugs, dentures, orthopedic shoes, eyeglasses, or hearing aids.

BILL DOES NOT COVER ALL MEDICAL COSTS

It is important for Americans to understand that H.R. 6675 is not a free medical care bill. The hospital and other medical services covered by the two plans are not paid in full under these plans.

Under the basic hospital plan, a patient must pay the first \$40 of cost during the first 60 days, plus \$10 a day for each day after that during the next

30 days. The plan does not pay any hospital costs after these 90 days during one spell of illness. So the patient has to find some means of paying hospital care after 90 days.

A patient sent to a nursing home after receiving hospital care would pay \$5 a day beginning with the 21st day through the 100th day in the nursing home. After 100 days of a single spell of illness, the plan pays nothing more toward nursing home care.

Furthermore, if costs of hospital and nursing home services go up, patients may have to pay greater amounts beginning in 1969. Hospital costs have been rising about 7 percent a year over the past few years.

Under the supplementary insurance plan, those past 65 wishing this insurance must pay \$3 per month. The Federal Government also pays \$3 per month.

Under H.R. 6675, these premiums could be increased every 2 years. If costs of the services covered go up sufficiently, those past 65 can look forward to further increases in their monthly premium.

In addition, under the supplementary plan, patients must pay a \$50 deductible, which means they must pay the first \$50 of expenses incurred for physicians' services and other health items covered by this insurance. In addition, patients must pay 20 percent of costs above the first \$50.

OLDER AMERICANS NEED MORE PROTECTION

I mention these matters so that Americans past 65 will be aware that the two medical plans contained in this bill will not pay all of their health and medical bills.

It is only fair to caution our senior citizens that they should protect themselves against medical expenses not taken care of by the basic plan or the supplementary plan through additional insurance. Otherwise, they may face some costly bills to pay out of savings.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF TWO NEW MEDICAL PLANS

Another very important reminder to those who will be eligible for these medical programs: benefits under both the basic plan and the supplementary plan will not be available until July 1, 1966. Benefits in nursery homes and other extended care facilities will not be available until January 1, 1967.

So, I say to our older Americans, when this bill passes, do not cancel your present health insurance policies. Do not let your health insurance lapse between now and the date when these plans become effective.

Your present insurance company will probably revise its policies so that they will not overlap the benefits of the health insurance plans of this bill. They will, I am confident, devise policies offering coverage and benefits not provided under the two plans of this bill.

Also, most businesses with health insurance programs for their employees will revise these policies to be effective after the basic Government insurance and supplementary insurance plans go into effect.

URGES HEALTH INSURANCE FOR ELDERLY

I say again to our older Americans: Do not leave yourself unprotected dur-

ing the next year and a half before benefits are available to you under H.R. 6675.

If you do not now have health insurance that will help pay hospital, doctor, and medical bills, I would urge you to obtain such insurance. No one knows when illness may strike. It might be before benefits under either plan in H.R. 6675 will be available to you. So take the sensible precaution of protecting yourself against costly illness.

Here I would like to urge private health insurance companies to do their very best to provide reasonable-cost and effective policies to protect older persons against medical costs not covered in the two plans of this bill.

BASIC HOSPITAL-NURSING HOME PLAN

As I have already stated, the basic plan for hospital, nursing home, and related care would be financed through an increase in the social security tax on wages of workers, their employers, and self-employed persons; by higher railroad retirement taxes, and by charges levied on elderly patients.

The tax increase would go into effect January 1, 1966. But benefits for patients would not be offered until July 1, 1966, except that care in nursing homes and other posthospital extended care facilities would not be available until January 1, 1967.

About 17 million persons insured under social security and railroad retirement and 2 million uninsured persons past age 65 would qualify at that time.

Costs of the program for uninsured persons would come out of general revenues of the U.S. Treasury.

After 1967, anyone wishing to qualify must have sufficient social security or railroad retirement coverage.

Benefits under this compulsory plan are as follows:

First. Up to 90 days in a hospital in each spell of illness. Sixty days must elapse between each spell of illness. Patient pays \$40 deductible, plus \$10 a day for each day up to 30 days in hospital after first 60 days. No doctors' nor private duty nursing services paid by this plan.

Second. After 3 days or more of hospitalization, up to 100 days in a nursing home or other facility having an arrangement with the hospital from which the patient is transferred. After the first 20 days, the patient pays \$5 a day up to 80 days toward his care.

Third. Outpatient hospital diagnostic service, with the patient paying a \$20-deductible amount and 20 percent of the cost above that for diagnostic studies by the same hospital during a 20-day period.

Fourth. After hospitalization, home health services for up to 100 visits after discharge from the hospital or nursing home and before the beginning of a new spell of illness. These services would include intermittent nursing care, therapy, and the part-time services of a home health aid.

COST OF BASIC HOSPITAL-NURSING HOME PLAN

The first full year this plan is in effect would cost \$2,210 million out of the health insurance trust fund and \$290 million out of the U.S. Treasury. In time the bill provides that all costs would be

paid out of the health insurance trust fund.

TAXES FOR HOSPITAL-NURSING HOME PLAN

The social security tax rate would be 0.35 percent on earnings up to \$6,600, starting next January 1. The tax rate would rise from time to time to 0.80 percent starting in 1987.

A worker or a self-employed person earning \$6,600 would pay \$23.10 for hospital insurance in calendar year 1966. His employer would match the tax each of his workers pays.

In 1967, the tax on \$6,600 on the worker would total \$33, and it would go up until it reached \$52.80 a year in 1987 and thereafter.

PREFERS GENERAL REVENUE FINANCING OF HOSPITAL PLAN

As I have already stated, I believe general revenue financing should be used for the hospital-nursing home program, which is a service program, not a wage-related cash benefit program, as existing social security is.

Certainly, this would be a much fairer way to distribute the cost burden. Then each person under 65 would pay taxes according to his income, in other words, according to his ability to pay.

Moreover, before income taxes are levied, a taxpayer is allowed to exempt \$600 for himself and \$600 for his spouse and \$600 for each dependent. He also is permitted to subtract either the standard or itemized deduction from his gross income before the income tax applies.

Not so with social security taxes.

Social security taxes apply to the first dollar of wages earned and to every dollar earned up to the maximum taxable, \$6,600 under H.R. 6675. No exemptions and no deductions from gross income are allowed before social security taxes are applied.

Social security taxes are not based on ability to pay. A \$6,600 worker pays the same amount of tax as a \$66,000 executive.

This is grossly unfair.

Last year Congress enacted an anti-poverty program designed to help those in low-income brackets, roughly those with \$3,000 or less income a year.

Congress also reduced income taxes last year to relieve lower income persons of this burden. More than 1½ million low-income persons were relieved entirely of paying Federal income taxes.

Yet H.R. 6675 proposes higher social security taxes, which hit lower income groups hardest.

This is very inconsistent to say the least.

But it is plain that a move for general revenue financing of the entire hospital insurance program would be overwhelmingly defeated in the Senate today. Too many are committed to the social security approach in support of the administration.

CONCERN FOR WAGE EARNERS

Nevertheless, I must express my concern for the wage earners of America. For, this hospital program is bound to expand and the burden on wage earners to increase.

Those who pay the hospital insurance tax will be men and women workers un-

July 28, 1965

17851

duced to 1 year without dependents, and there is no reason why our military personnel should live like squawmen with their wives and children when serving overseas in Western Europe or in the Far East. By cutting down the length of the tour of duty and eliminating dependents we would save billions of dollars of taxpayers' money and at the same time greatly reduce the outflow of gold. Furthermore, our military posture and combat readiness would be enhanced in Western Europe.

We should no longer permit American military personnel and their dependents to pour billions of dollars into the German, Spanish, and French economies each year. The French people, in a crude imitation of their leader, have come to despise Americans. Our soldiers, their wives, and their children living off base in France pay exorbitant rents and taxes to De Gaulle's France. They not only pay exorbitant rent for unsatisfactory apartments and houses, but they also pay high taxes on their utility bills. The dislike of the French for us is evidenced also by the separate pricing of goods sold to Americans and goods sold to their own nationals.

I have been in France recently and have witnessed for myself the fact that the French people have a great dislike for us.

Simultaneously with removing most of our Armed Forces from France, with the exception of the Air Force units stationed over there, which, after all, are the only real deterrent against Soviet aggression—remote as is the possibility of that aggression—it would be in order to demand some substantial repayment of the billions of dollars loaned to France on which that nation has defaulted.

We saved France by our dollars and by our men. Of course, there are many thousands of Americans in France who will be there forever. They will not be returned to this country. However, we should demand a return of some of the billions of dollars loaned to France.

If President de Gaulle continues to insist on payments of gold from our Nation, it would be in order for us to take other measures to provide against the import of Renault automobiles and other French products. This would be in retaliation for the heavy taxes which American GI's, living off base with their dependents, must continually pay to the French Government when they pay for rent, utilities, and the purchase of articles.

The danger of aggression from the Soviet Union in Western Europe has greatly diminished. It is practically nonexistent at the present time. The Soviet Union is now a have nation and is definitely veering away from Red China, which is a have not nation. Former Senator Barry Goldwater may have been correct in his prediction that 10 years hence Russia would be our ally in any conflict with Red China.

Today our first line of defense against Communist aggression and infiltration is in southeast Asia, according to the statement made to the American people today by our President. That is where the bulk of our troops should be stationed—not in

Western Europe, where the need for them in large numbers no longer exists, and where their presence adds to our country's balance-of-payments problem. It is ridiculous to think of maintaining, 20 years after the close of World War II, 340,000 American servicemen and officers in Western Europe—in West Germany, France, and Belgium.

It is high time that those countries, prosperous as never before, should cease to depend on us to conscript our teenage youngsters when they do not make those same sacrifices themselves.

Mr. President, our Nation does not have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world. Sometimes people seem to forget that when talking about Asia and Africa. We must utilize our military personnel to the best extent possible.

An important step toward doing so would be to withdraw thousands of our troops now stationed unnecessarily in the countries of Western Europe, which are prospering as never before. Those countries can today provide the necessary troops to defend themselves if that need should ever occur.

Those countries should do this for themselves instead of continuing to depend on us. Let their young men be conscripted and drafted into their own armed services. Why should the lives and aspirations of our teenage young men be disrupted to form the first line of defense for the German and French Governments, whose officials and nationals have come to despise us? The feelings of Western Europeans are manifest to us on every possible occasion.

It is nitpicking to advocate that American tourists, men and women schoolteachers, and husbands and wives who save money for a vacation in Europe should forgo their trip to reduce the outflow of gold when we have 340,000 men of our Armed Forces in Western Europe, plus wives, dependents, and American civilians employed by the Armed Forces. That is where the real outflow of gold takes place.

Jefferson
THE PRESIDENT'S RADIO ADDRESS
ON THE VIETNAMESE SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President in his statement today for the first time admitted that the United States is at war. When asked by a reporter, "What are the borders of your authority to conduct a war without a declaration of war?" the President obviously side-stepped the issue. The sad fact is the President is involving the United States in an undeclared war without first following his responsibilities under the Constitution.

Another sad fact is that the Congress is permitting the President to send increasing numbers of American boys to their death in Asia without facing up to its constitutional duty of either declaring war or denying the President permission to send American boys to their slaughter.

It is difficult for me to understand how both the President and the Congress can flout the Constitution of the United States. Again, I warn the American peo-

ple that, unless government by executive supremacy is checked in the United States, our constitutional system of three coordinate and coequal branches of government will become more and more jeopardized.

The President of the United States should be required to either conduct a war in Asia in accordance with the terms and conditions of a declaration of war, or he should be prevented by the Congress from making war.

If neither Congress nor the President are willing to act within the framework of the Constitution, the people of the United States should make clear to both the Congress and the President and demand that procedures provided for in the Constitution remain inviolate.

On April 2, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson underscored the duty of a President when he addressed the Congress in a joint session; and I quote that great Democratic President when he spoke these historic words. They ought to be seared into the present President of the United States in these tragic hours. For Woodrow Wilson said at the night joint session of the Congress of the United States on April 2, 1917:

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

For the historic record, may I reread that great statement of Woodrow Wilson for the benefit of the present President of the United States and the Members of the 89th Congress. President Wilson said at the night joint session of Congress on April 2, 1917:

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

I say, in all due respect—but these are hours in which impersonality must prevail—that the incumbent President has no constitutional power to make war in Asia in the absence of a declaration of war. As Woodrow Wilson cited in a joint session of the Congress on the night of April 2, 1917, it was not within the constitutional permissive power to make war against Germany in the absence of a declaration of war. He did what any President ought to do and what is the clear constitutional responsibility of any President to do before he sends American boys to slaughter in an undeclared war. He owes a responsibility to the people of the United States to come before a joint session of Congress and make a recommendation for a declaration of war.

The Congress has a coordinate responsibility to decide, under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, whether American boys are going to be killed in a war, for if they are killed in an undeclared war, it is murder. I use that term advisedly. If American boys are killed in an undeclared war, it is murder. That is a constitutional reality.

July 28, 1965

Mr. President, I have never taken, and will never take a position that, in my judgment, violates my trust in regard to living up to this constitutional system. I say again today, as I have said for the past 2 years from this desk in the Senate, that the President has a clear responsibility under the Constitution to give the elected officials of the people of this country in the Congress an opportunity to pass on the recommendation he may wish to make for war. But if the President of the United States is allowed to continue to make war without a declaration of war, Congress will be jeopardizing our system of constitutional government based upon three coordinate and coequal branches of government.

I warn the American people again today that if they continue to let this President, or any President, take executive powers free from the checks of the Constitution of the United States, they are on the way to losing their freedoms and liberties. History teaches that as a government of executive supremacy is built up—I do not care what label one attaches to that government—the people cannot remain free, because under a government of executive supremacy the people will be victimized by the arbitrary discretion of a one-man rule.

So again I call my President's attention to the great lesson of President Wilson on the night of April 2, 1917, and I call attention to the great lesson of President Franklin Roosevelt when, before a joint session of the Congress of the United States, he made his statement for a declaration of war following Pearl Harbor.

President Wilson went on in that historic speech in these almost sacred halls of Congress on the night of April 2, 1917, to say:

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

The Congress took the bill of particulars President Woodrow Wilson set out in his historic address, and, on the basis of that bill of particulars, decided it agreed with the President of the United States, and it passed the declaration of war.

In the President's statement today I followed very closely any allusion as to what countries we might declare war against on the basis of the President's rationalization and alibiing for killing American boys in Asia. I note that he made reference to North Vietnam and Red China.

The American people should say to the President now, "Do you believe that the facts warrant a declaration of war against North Vietnam and Red China? If you do, make your recommendation in

accordance with your responsibilities under the Constitution for such a declaration of war, and let Congress decide whether or not it wants to declare war."

Mr. President, I shall not avoid, as I have never avoided, any hot issue. On the basis of what the President said today, on the basis of what he has said in the past 2 years, on the basis of anything the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State have said before the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, if the President should recommend a declaration of war against North Vietnam and Red China, the senior Senator from Oregon would vote against it.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the President cannot make a case for a declaration of war against either North Vietnam or Red China—and I hate and despise the regimes of both North Vietnam and Red China.

Let me warn Congress that during these dark hours it is making history which will live for centuries to come; that is, if there is a United States left for a U.S. history to survive.

These are tragic hours, in which not only Congress, but also the American people, must rededicate themselves to the ideals which we profess. I say most solemnly that we had better rededicate ourselves to our sense of spiritual values, for I continue to ask myself: What has happened to morality in the United States? What has happened to our professions about being a spiritual Nation and believing in a Divine Being?

As a Christian, I keep saying to myself, "What has happened to the practice of the teachings of the Master in American foreign policy?" In my judgment, American foreign policy is characterized today by many bad things, but the worst is its emptiness of spiritual and moral values.

It is time for us to bow our heads and fall to our knees as a nation and pray as we have never prayed before for that strength of character, that rededication to spiritual values, that will cause us to turn away from being a shocking, war-making nation to a nation which will rededicate itself to the rule of law.

In my speech I have sought, thus far, to outline my deep conviction as to what I consider to be the constitutional duty of the President of the United States. It is his constitutional duty. In my judgment, either to recommend a declaration of war or to stop being primarily responsible for the killing of American boys in Asia.

The decision of war is not entrusted to the President of the United States. It is entrusted to Congress. The Constitution so provides, and it will be abandoned only at great risk. For, when the people allow the head of State to conduct war without any check upon his decision, they have lost control of their national affairs.

The President spoke of war, but it can only be an illegal war until it is declared by Congress.

The President spoke of the commitments of past Presidents to Vietnam, and of our national good word. But he uttered no mention of the national word entered into by solemn treaty when we

signed the United Nations Charter. The President wishes the world to have confidence in the pledge of a previous President, but does he have no concern with what the world thinks of our failure to honor our own treaty obligations?

It is a sad day in history when the President of the United States dismisses our obligations to the United Nations Charter with reference to a letter he has sent to U Thant, asking that he do what he can to help us "fry our fish" in Vietnam.

The press conference today produced nothing but an evasion by the President of both the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations.

I also regret that the President did not take the American people into his confidence by explaining to them the responses from other governments to the war in Vietnam.

I believe that the obvious conclusion to be drawn from his reluctance to discuss that subject is that the support is so thin, and the offers of help so non-existent, that it was better to avoid that issue, too.

But, if we are asked to embark on a long, drawn-out struggle—and the President admits that it may be long—we should know exactly how little help or support we are to get from the other major powers of Asia, and from the rest of the world.

The net result of the President's remarks has been a repeat performance of what we have been told month in and month out concerning Vietnam; namely, that more American soldiers will be sent. Now the figure is to be increased to 125,000.

I have warned the American people from this desk for many months past that it will be 300,000. I warn the American people today that if the President's announced program continues, it will go far beyond the 300,000. And there will be no peace at the end of the trail.

The President points out that a new effort will be made to bring some order out of chaos in the South Vietnamese Government and gain support for it in the country. That will be quite a task. Never has there been a free government in South Vietnam since the United States set up its first puppet government in 1954. Yet the American people have been fed the false propaganda, ever since we took over in South Vietnam, that we are in there supporting freedom. What we have supported is tyrannical, shocking, police states by way of puppet regimes financed, selected, and militarized by the Government of the United States.

It is difficult for Americans to recognize that we could be so wrong, but history will condemn America's aggressive course of action in Asia over the years. We have not been true to our ideals. We have not been true to our treaty responsibilities and obligations.

It is interesting that in the statement made by the President today, he indicated there might be an ultimate decision which he would have made by the people of Vietnam for a united Vietnam.

Few Americans realize that the Geneva accord did not provide for two governments in South Vietnam. Most

people are unaware of the fact that the government that was set up in South Vietnam was set up by the United States in clear violation of the Geneva accords of 1954. The accords themselves provided only for two zones for purposes of terminating French control, the zones to be unified in elections to be held in 1956. It was the United States more than any other country that canceled those elections. How can a President who seeks to follow a policy of preserving South Vietnam at risk of world war, in pursuit of a promise he claims was made by two predecessors, declare at the same time that we may want to go back to a unified Vietnam? Which of these incompatible purposes is our real purpose in Vietnam?

Most people do not know, either, as I have said so many times on the floor of the Senate during the past 2 years, that we have violated the Geneva accords with every airplane we sent over, with every soldier we sent over, with every tank we sent over; and, of course, that the International Control Commission found us guilty, along with North Vietnam, and along with the South Vietnamese.

Mr. President, there was no indication in the President's statement today concerning another sordid and ugly fact which exists in South Vietnam, the very moment I speak; namely, that the South Vietnamese army has so deteriorated that we shall have to substitute American boys to do the dying for them.

"By what right?" the senior Senator from Oregon asks, and will continue to ask. We have no constitutional right, which has been effectuated to date, that justifies the unconscionable slaughter of American boys in South Vietnam. It is an elementary principle of criminal law that when a life is taken in the commission of an illegal act it falls into the category of homicide. I have no intention of becoming an accomplice to homicide in southeast Asia.

The President also made clear today that any government beside our own that interferes in South Vietnam will meet the full force of the American power.

That is waving the flag into tatters. That is no way to pay respect to the American flag.

We have reached the point where we are beating our national chest, while saying to the world that we are setting ourselves up as the policeman and caretaker for the running of the world in accordance with what we consider is best for the world in accordance with American judgments.

That is why it will require many years to do it. That is why I say we are starting to dig our national grave, because millions of people around the world will continue to resist and revolt against a police and caretaker role imposed upon them by the United States.

Mr. President, instead of sending a letter to U Thant, the President of the United States should have sent with Ambassador Goldberg a resolution from the United States, asking for an extraordinary session of the Security Council, and requesting the United Nations to take jurisdiction of the conflict in Vietnam.

For my President to talk about the United Nations in the absence of filing a

formal petition by the United States calling upon the United Nations to carry out its obligations under the provisions of the Charter is naught but an exercise in semantics.

If my country wants the United Nations to take jurisdiction, my President knows how to bring it about. The procedures are clear. The President knows them. I have seen to that. All my President has to do is to lay before the United Nations the resolution. He can do that through our Ambassador to the United Nations. If he did that, the threat to the peace of the world would be formally and officially before the Security Council. Then we would find out who it is that wants peace. Then we would put Red Russia on the spot. We would put France on the spot, too, along with every other nation that belongs to the Security Council.

If the Soviet Union then throws a veto, the President knows what the charter provides by way of our right to have an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations called.

As a former U.S. delegate to the General Assembly, it is my judgment that at least 90 nations, and probably more, in the General Assembly would rally behind the leadership of the United States if it proposed a United Nations takeover in southeast Asia—not to make war, such as my country is doing at the present time, but to keep the peace.

There is all the difference in the world between the President of the United States directing a war and the President of the United States talking peace.

We are hitching irreconcilables at both ends of a line, while they pull in opposite directions. I would like to see a better example of that type of metaphoric exercise than the President of the United States making war in Asia and at the same time talking about peace through the United Nations, without formally submitting to the United Nations a U.S. resolution calling for the peace-keeping services of the United Nations.

The President spoon fed the American people today with the same old prescription which in the past 4 years has resulted only in more war and more defeat. I see no reason for any different outcome this time.

It is with a heavy heart and a great sadness that I say that in my judgment the President's position is unsound and against the best interest of peace and a world order of law.

For the Proxmire
LET US BE REALISTIC ABOUT THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a great deal of criticism has been directed at the administration's Vietnam policy, on the ground that the whole tragic business should be turned over to the United Nations.

The administration has indicated that U.N. Director General U Thant would be welcome to use his U.N. offices to secure negotiations or to do anything else that might advance peace.

The Communists have rejected all of these initiatives. We cannot turn to the U.N. for practical reasons. Use of the

U.N. Assembly and use of the U.N. Security Council are both blocked.

In this morning's Washington Post a very perceptive editorial explains why. The editorial asks:

But how could any serious student of world affairs suppose that anything could be accomplished at this time by going to the U.N.?

The Soviet Union stands over the Security Council with its veto poised against any action that might be taken to save South Vietnam from being swept into the Communist orbit. The last session of the General Assembly was so plagued by the controversy over the financing of past U.N. peacekeeping operations that it could act only by unanimous consent. That issue has not yet been resolved. However desirable it would be to have the U.N. straightening out situations of this kind, neither the suffering Vietnamese nor the cause of freedom and independence in Asia can wait for a miracle.

A few minutes ago the President of the United States said that 15 efforts, with the help of 40 nations, have been made to persuade the Asian Communists to negotiate.

The President also said that if the United Nations can by deed or word bring us nearer to an honorable peace, it will have American support, and that Ambassador Goldberg has been directed to tell the United Nations that we want all resources of the United Nations used to achieve peace.

It seems to me that one of the most unfortunate illusions on the part of literally millions of American people is that the whole situation would be ended if only we were to turn to the U.N. and say, "Take over."

In the first place, there are reasons why this cannot be done. In the second place, if the U.N. were to come in, is there any reason to deceive ourselves that they could come in on any basis other than that on which they came in during the Korean conflict? If they came in under those circumstances, we would still have to fight, as we did in Korea. It would still take years. It would still involve the loss of American blood. It would still mean American caskets coming back. This would not end it. Furthermore, if we can get the United Nations to come in, fine, but there is no indication that the United Nations, under present circumstances, can do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ILLUSIONS AT MINNEAPOLIS

Against the background of mounting warfare in Vietnam and the grave discussions that have been going on at the White House, the dissenting notes coming out of the Governors conference in Minneapolis sound very remote and unreal. In Vietnam the American forces are having to cope with more powerful attacks on the ground and with a rising menace from surface-to-air missiles. In Washington the whole baffling problem of helping the South Vietnamese and other peoples of southeast Asia protect their independence has been under review. But out in Minneapolis the Governors are free to indulge in fanciful illusions.

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, advanced the idea that the United States

July 28, 1965

should take the Vietnam problem to the United Nations. If this did not produce results and if the fighting should continue to spread, he said, the President should ask Congress for a declaration of war. It is easy to understand a Republican Governor's impatience over the present gloomy trend of events in Vietnam. But how could any serious student of world affairs suppose that anything could be accomplished at this time by going to the U.N.?

The Soviet Union stands over the Security Council with its veto poised against any action that might be taken to save South Vietnam from being swept into the Communist orbit. The last session of the General Assembly was so plagued by the controversy over the financing of past U.N. peacekeeping operations that it could act only by unanimous consent. That issue has not yet been resolved. However desirable it would be to have the U.N. straightening out situations of this kind, neither the suffering Vietnamese nor the cause of freedom and independence in Asia can wait for a miracle.

As for a declaration of war, what would it accomplish? Would the declaration be directed against the Vietcong in South Vietnam, against the Hanoi government, Communist China, or the Soviet Union? Or would it be directed against all four? The disturbing thing about this comment is that any conceivable declaration of war in the present context of events would doubtlessly lead to expansion of the war instead of narrowing it as Governor Hatfield intends. Critics are entitled to air their grave concern over the dilemma in Vietnam, but when they attempt to point the way out they ought to have something more substantial than midsummer night's dream.

AMENDMENTS TO BANKRUPTCY ACT—BILLS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE WITH INSTRUCTIONS

Mr. KUCHEL obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall yield to the majority leader with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 109, a bill (S. 978) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy and Calendar No. 265, a bill (S. 1912) to amend sections 1, 17a, 57g, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act and for other purposes, be taken off the calendar and referred to the Committee on Finance with instructions that they be reported back within a period of 30 days.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—let the RECORD show that the majority leader has informed the minority whip. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], a coauthor of the bill, completely approves, as does our able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the other author of the bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the executive calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Hiram R. Cancio, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Puerto Rico; and

Edmund A. Nix, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review; and

Doctor Mary I. Bunting, of Massachusetts, and Harvey Picker, of New York, to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I desire to take a moment of time in the Senate to speak not merely as a member of the Republican Party, but as an American to pay my respects for one who has undertaken the most grueling type of service to his country.

Henry Cabot Lodge sat as a distinguished U.S. Senator in days gone by.

He was recommended by his political party as a candidate for Vice President of this land.

He was an able advocate for the people of the United States in the United Nations, on one occasion serving under the late President John F. Kennedy.

He represented our country in South Vietnam with distinction and courage.

He now returns to that unhappy part of this melancholy globe.

He takes with him the prayers of the American people for success in that tragic part of the world. We also pray

that his service may increase our chances for peace with honor in South Vietnam.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] in commending the President and Ambassador Lodge, who has had such a wonderful career, and who now has every right to say, "I have done my work; I am entitled to enjoy the fruits of my labors," for taking on this enormous and historic assignment.

I know we have run our foreign affairs in a completely bipartisan way. I have been an advocate of a bipartisan foreign policy.

I know that I shall be pardoned if I say with some pride that it is a matter of great gratification to me that in a historic moment the President found it possible to appoint a great Republican candidate for Vice President who made a great record in the Senate, and who has been proud of his progressive views in my party. My last close personal contact with him was in the work of bringing those views to the attention of the members of my party throughout the country in the most effective way.

Henry Cabot Lodge is entitled to the deep thanks of the Nation for having deserved such a historic assignment from the President. The Nation is fortunate to have raised such a son. We have every reason for great pride in my party and his lifelong devotion to principles of that party, demonstrating again the place of great Americans in each of the great political parties and their devotion to the principles which they hold and respect.

These only equip him the better for the Nation's service, rather than constricting them in any narrow partisan frame.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in speaking in support of the Republican leader of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], one immediately senses a need for clarifying the issue before the Senate. A highly

July 28, 1965

17875

He reported on the FBI's study, during 1963 and 1964, of the criminal records of nearly 93,000 offenders, of whom more than three-fourths had been arrested at least twice.

The following table shows the rate of serious crime per 100,000 of population in the Nation's 12 largest metropolitan areas during 1964:

	Population	Murder	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Theft	Auto theft	Total offenses
New York	11,362,000	6.1	10.1	76.1	139.9	540.1	725.6	348.9	1,845.7
Los Angeles	6,682,000	4.8	29.1	171.2	230.7	1,400.8	838.7	587.7	3,263.0
Chicago	6,531,000	7.2	21.1	273.9	202.6	658.9	513.5	582.3	2,259.5
Philadelphia	4,565,000	5.4	14.1	75.2	121.5	515.7	224.5	235.7	1,192.2
Detroit	3,891,000	5.0	20.5	152.5	143.3	757.0	461.8	387.1	1,927.0
Boston	3,213,000	2.6	6.0	41.3	42.2	530.2	321.4	578.8	1,522.4
San Francisco	2,935,000	4.3	13.1	116.9	117.1	1,057.9	506.0	502.0	2,317.3
Pittsburgh	2,359,000	2.8	8.7	57.4	41.2	440.5	232.1	319.0	1,101.6
Washington	2,300,000	8.4	11.6	129.0	188.8	870.3	451.0	413.5	2,072.6
St. Louis	2,208,000	7.2	14.8	121.6	125.5	942.6	332.5	373.0	1,917.3
Cleveland	1,997,000	6.4	6.6	92.7	67.0	601.6	136.5	271.7	1,182.5
Baltimore	1,858,000	9.0	11.6	84.1	161.2	492.5	516.5	314.9	1,588.8

Frederic M. Yarrow PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S NEWS CONFERENCE EMPHASIZES THE NEED FOR THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the notice of increased military commitment of this Nation in the Vietnam crisis, and the President's order for increasing the monthly draft quotas substantially, emphasizes the continuing and deepening need for the enactment of the cold war GI bill.

As more of our young men are called upon to serve in uniform, the inequities and the injustices that prevail upon the cold war veterans of the United States are proportionately increased. As more men are activated, more lives are interrupted, more educations are halted, and more careers damaged by time in the military service.

As long as these demands continue to rise, and as long as the burden largely falls on those young men who are not able to afford education, the need for the cold war GI bill will forever continue to mount.

I hope that today's action will serve as a rallying cry to gather the forces of justice behind this bill and carry it through all the legislative entanglements to final enactment and to the White House for signature.

INCREASE IN CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week, a long-time and very good friend of mine was walking her dogs in Montrose Park, where she was raped by three assailants between 8:45 and 10:15 in the morning.

I rise not only to express my horror and shock at this occurrence, but also to deplore the unequal and losing contest between the forces of law and the forces of crime in our Nation's Capital.

The index of District crime in the past 12 months has risen 28 percent. As a result, every section of our police force is overstrained, including men and material. Some 200,000 hours of uncompensated, voluntary time was contributed by our police in this past year alone. Nevertheless, there is an immense shortage of police officers, vehicles, and resources. The police are finding themselves virtually engulfed by the flood of crime. Translated into my friend's experience, this meant an unintentional

detention in the police precinct of 2 hours, part of which was spent in answering questions and part in waiting for the arrival of a second victim of a similar crime.

This second victim was being interviewed in her apartment, where she had been raped some hours earlier. Turn and turn about, the second "rapee" then had to wait while the scene of my friend's assault in Montrose Park was revisited. Both victims were Georgetown residents. The dictates of the District's economy were such that both ladies had to travel together in the same vehicle to the District of Columbia General Hospital, where they were to undergo an examination in order to determine the virulence of the assault. This examination was necessary because the findings of these examinations are used as evidence in the case of criminal proceedings.

Although my friend had reached the precinct police station at 10:25 a.m., it was only at 1:15 p.m. that both victims reached District of Columbia General Hospital. And, then it was not until 2:55 p.m. that my friend was on the examining table. By 5 minutes past 3, the smears had been taken and the forms of the report had been filled in. The detectives on the case were preparing to take the two victims to the Central Police Bureau, C and Third Streets NW., for full depositions, which they told my friend normally took up to 2 hours.

Though almost 5 hours had passed since my friend first fled the scene of her rape, no attention had yet been paid to her own state of being or bringing her into contact with her own doctor. Moreover, my friend had asked, following the hospital examination, to have a basic prophylaxis, a cleansing, which she was told was impossible, there being no facilities for such in the Outpatients' Department of the District of Columbia General Hospital.

I believe that this kind of treatment or absence of treatment could be construed as inhuman negligence on the part of our District police and medical authorities, particularly as abortions can be performed only under exceptional conditions in the District of Columbia, except for the fact that these authorities are so overworked. Yet, neither negligence nor strain can be further tolerated.

I was gratified to see in today's papers

that my friend's complaint about the treatment of rape cases had led the District of Columbia General Hospital to change its procedures somewhat. The medical-legal lab tests will now be followed by a cleansing with a germicidal solution and a blood test providing a syphilis check.

This is a step in the right direction, but in my opinion is only a beginning on the part of hospital and police authorities.

My friend finally reached her private physician seven hours after being raped and only after refusing to return to police headquarters for additional questioning. Our hospitals and police authorities must recognize that proper treatment of rape involves much more than physical care—the deep mental and emotional shock, anguish and fear are equally important and must receive medical and psychological attention as well. I would hope that the authorities would conduct a full review of their procedures in this respect and make an even further effort to humanize them.

But there is still an immense need for more support of our crime enforcement authorities, more police, and more resources.

I am sadly reminded that only a few months ago, another old friend was taking a walk along the canal and was murdered. These crimes occurred in daylight. These crimes have occurred in the past and continue to occur all the time.

Speaking not just as a U.S. Senator but as a resident of the District because of my job, and also as a husband and father, I submit that the lawlessness in our area has gone too far. I know that now, in the part of Washington where I live, it is not safe for my family to walk our dogs in the morning in a neighboring park.

What does it take to secure action from the District of Columbia authorities? How long do we continue to tolerate and to take half measures? Do we rise up in anger only when our own wives or daughters or friends are involved, or when we ourselves are struck down or yoked? Washington may not be any worse and perhaps may be even better than other cities, according to statistics. All I know and believe is that the situation is utterly out of hand, and it is time we acknowledged it and did something about it.

I would hope that the whole question of the handling of victims of rape would be even more thoroughly reviewed by the Board of Commissioners.

Finally, I would hope that the President's war on crime might start and be waged with particular vigor right here in our Capital City.

I am sending copies of this statement to each member of the Senate and House District of Columbia Committees, and to each of the District Commissioners, together with a discerning article portraying these horrible events.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article which was published in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 25, 1965, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTIM OF RAPE SAYS MEDICAL SEARCH FOR EVIDENCE COLDLY IGNORES PATIENT

(By Jean M. White)

A woman raped repeatedly in a Georgetown park area last week has assailed medical procedures that she feels coldly ignore the victim while collecting legal evidence.

"There was the examination for the Government to fill out forms. And that was that. They should at least offer the victim the decency of an opportunity for washing and cleansing," she says.

The wife of a State Department official, obviously a woman of strong fiber, has reached the point where she now speaks with righteous indignation beyond her own personal experience.

"I did finally get to my private physician," she explains. "But what about the impoverished patient? Does she have to go back to the outpatient line and wait six or eight hours for attention? What about the humiliated, upset girl who is afraid of pregnancy?"

Police and a spokesman for District of Columbia General Hospital emphasize that one of the first steps in a rape case must be the collection of "fresh, conclusive evidence" that the crime has been committed. This involves a semen smear from the victim to detect the presence of sperm.

The Georgetown wife, who went back to the rape scene with police, agrees. But she emphasizes that the routine examination took only 10 minutes and she feels there comes a time when some thought should be given to the victim.

She tells what happened to her:

"When I asked for a simple thing like a douche, I was told that there were no facilities at District of Columbia General for this. They did not even have the decency to offer me a sponge or tissue for cleansing.

"Once the smear is taken, it seems to me that any rape or sex victim should have access to a prophylactic procedure because she is worried about disease and infection. I still had twigs on my hair and body when I reached my private physician."

PASSED YOUTHS ON LANE

The victim saw her own private doctor about 7 hours after she was raped. She insisted on making an appointment with him rather than going to central police headquarters for further statement taking.

Her harrowing day began a little after 8:30 a.m. Thursday. She was walking her two dogs on the edge of Montrose Park when she passed two youths on the lane. She heard a whistle behind her. Then she was being yoked, and two other youths appeared.

She was wrestled and half-carried up a steep bank, where three of the four assaulted her while the fourth held the dogs and served as a lookout.

Finally left by the rapists, she called her dogs and made her way to Massachusetts Avenue and went by taxi to the seventh police precinct. She arrived there at 10:25 a.m.; Park Police were called in, and she was taken to District General Hospital, where the laboratory exam was made about 3 p.m. She finally reached her private physician's office close to 5 p.m.

HOSPITAL FUNCTION EXPLAINED

Dr. Gustavo Nava, medical officer in charge of the emergency services at District General, said that the hospital's function is to examine the patient for "medical-legal evidence" and not to treat her.

"We're not supposed to volunteer prophylactic treatment for disease or pregnancy," he said. "Our part is the determination of rape. Upon request from the patient, we would answer questions. In 2½ years here, I still have to see a request."

But would a distraught, humiliated victim of rape have enough presence of mind to ask for help? asks the State Department official's wife.

Dr. Nava said the practice at District General is to take a semen smear and a smear to determine whether there has been any gonorrhea contamination. Factors of the victim's menstrual cycle and fertile period are considered in gathering the medical-legal information, he said.

PRIVATE DOCTORS GIVE VIEWS

Advice might be given on request, he said, but "they are not brought to us for treatment."

One private physician, asked to comment on post-rape treatment, said he probably would recommend a D and C (dilation and curettage, which involves scraping of the womb) if there was any danger of possible pregnancy. This could come in a week or so, he said, after infection has been ruled out. It is a minor surgical procedure.

He said he also would take a smear to detect gonorrhea and, if positive then would order penicillin treatment. There would also be blood tests to establish a "base line" for later syphilis tests.

Another gynecologist indicated that he would not automatically recommend a D and C. If a rape-induced pregnancy occurred, he said, then a therapeutic abortion could be performed under Washington law as necessary for the mental health of the patient.

Both agree that douching would have only negligible effect on the prevention of venereal disease.

"But you must also remember the victim's mental state," the first physician noted. "She certainly wants it performed as soon as possible."

The wife of the State Department official agrees with this as "something elemental, humane" in treating rape victims. Her own doctor, she said, was appalled that no provision had been made to do this.

When the park victim arrived at seventh precinct headquarters on Thursday morning about 10:30, she was joined by a 30-year-old unmarried woman who had been raped the night before in her second-story Georgetown apartment.

FEARED TO CALL POLICE

A Central Intelligence Agency employee, the younger woman had feared to call police after the rape. The next morning she went to work and told a CIA personnel officer, who called police.

The two rape victims waited together at the police precinct where they were treated more like "cold statistics than human beings," the older woman said. She heard such phrases as "we got another one like this."

But she emphasized her quarrel is not so much with police procedure as with the medical procedure at District of Columbia General.

Police say they first try to collect on-the-spot evidence and get information for a lookout on the offenders. Then the rape victim is taken to District of Columbia General for the lab tests for evidence.

If a victim asks to see her private physician or to go to a private hospital, a police spokesman said, she is allowed to do this. But police prefer to take the victim to the municipal hospital, where the doctors and nurses know the need for witnesses and careful recording of information for later police evidence.

If the victim is then not too upset, she is taken back to police headquarters to make a statement.

"I agree that they must collect the evidence first," the wife of the State Department official said. "I willingly helped. But there comes a time for some consideration of the victim. I was not offered even the most primary services."

"I had been yoked and my neck hurt. I asked about this and was told a salt-water gargle would help. But no one offered me any."

One of the private physicians observed that

procedures vary on the handling of rape cases in different city hospitals. First, he emphasized, is the need to collect evidence. Then, he said, the usual procedure is to refer the patient to her private physician.

"Often emergency rooms do not like to give treatment without the consent of the patient's private physician," he said.

If the victim does not have her own doctor, he added, some recommendations for treatment should be made at that time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad that the Senator from Rhode Island has made this statement.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] came to me this morning concerning both the existing situation, and the comments which the Senator from Rhode Island intended to make this afternoon.

The Senator from New York is a member of my subcommittee on the District of Columbia, which has jurisdiction over law enforcement, the police, the welfare agencies, and, including, of course, the health programs in the District of Columbia.

I wish the Senator from Rhode Island to know that we plan to have a meeting of the subcommittee as soon as possible next week, the scheduling of the meeting being such that it probably will not meet until Thursday; but, in the meantime, the staff of the committee will apprise the District Commissioners, the Chief of Police, and the health authorities of our interest in the problem, and will see to it that they receive copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the Senator's speech. At the committee meeting next week, we shall ask them to come in and discuss with us the many facets of the problem.

I shall reserve final judgment until I have heard the responsible officials of the District of Columbia government who have jurisdiction over this general problem.

However, I have no hesitancy in saying at this time that I am at a loss to understand the time schedule that has been outlined by the Senator from Rhode Island in the handling of these two rape cases. I am at a loss to understand why it would be 5 hours before the individual concerned was given the health attention that I think she should have received almost immediately, taking into consideration the short period of time it would take to collect the necessary medical evidence in regard to her being raped.

To think that any woman should have to wait for more than 5 hours before her health needs were taken care of is astonishing. I believe that is the proper word for me to use at this time, although it does not express my inner feelings.

I am also at a loss to understand the procedure which is apparently being followed in such cases. In this instance, a highly intelligent woman obviously was cooperative with the police and the health authorities.

Let us not forget that in many instances people can suffer great psychological harm from an experience such as this. It is important that they receive attention immediately in regard to their

July 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17877

health needs and their psychological needs, in order to prevent irreparable permanent damage being done to them healthwise and psychologically.

I shall have a good many questions to ask our authorities in the District of Columbia in regard to the procedures that followed in this case.

Mr. PELL. I thank my friend from Oregon. I spoke to this woman today, and she took pains to emphasize her lack of hostility or lack of esteem for the police. She felt they were being overwhelmed by a mass of crime, by a mass of rapes, by a mass of violence, and were doing the very best they could, but that they were being engulfed.

One reason for her delay in receiving attention was that in the precinct involved there was only one vehicle available with which to take both victims to the hospital, and that they had to wait in order to go together and to stop by the place where the crime had taken place. The woman emphasized, knowing that I felt strongly on this subject, that she had no feeling that the police were not doing their best. There was just too much for their present facilities and manpower level.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I join the chairman in commending the Senator from Rhode Island for making his statement.

It should be remembered that not all persons who are victims of this kind of attack or other kinds of crime have a friend in the U.S. Senate, and therefore these facts cannot be brought to the attention of Senators. As a result it is not possible to have the kind of action that really is necessary in such instances in the District of Columbia, if anything is to be done about this problem.

With the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] I have sat through hearings. We have been distressed to hear of the mounting crime rate. Everyone is concerned about it. Speeches are made about the mounting crime rate in the District of Columbia. But really very little is done about it. During our hearings we urged that the District of Columbia come forward with a comprehensive plan to deal with crime; with a short-range program to deal with the immediate problem, and a long-term program, extending over, possibly, the next 10 years or so, to deal with the problem in detail.

It all comes down to the fact that we do have a responsibility in the Senate and in the House, and that we have not completely fulfilled our obligation in that regard. At the hearings this has been used as an excuse by those who have positions of responsibility within the District of Columbia. They can always come forward and state that the reason they have not done something about the problem is that Congress will not support them. They can always say, We cannot get any attention from the House of Representatives or the Senate, or the executive branch of the Government, and therefore we have not been able to do anything.

While serving as Attorney General and since coming to the Senate, I have seen many things that could be done in the District of Columbia in connection with crime and welfare and social services, things which have not been done through lack of interest, incompetence, laziness, or lack of attention to the problem.

It is always easy, therefore, for them to say: We would do more. We would do more for education and for welfare and in connection with crime, but it is the fault of Congress. A great deal of the blame lies with Congress.

It has been my experience, particularly in the field of education and crime, that the public officials who are charged with responsibility in the District have not met that responsibility. They have either been incompetent or lazy or careless. Many of the public officials in the District are dedicated to the work they are doing and are performing their work with great competence. That cannot be said of others.

They cannot be recalled, because there is no home rule in the District of Columbia. I hope that that law will go into effect, so that the people themselves will be able to make the decision. We are not trying to do it on the floor of the Senate.

I congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island for focusing attention on this subject. Otherwise, it would have been a story for a day and then passed out of the picture without anything having been done about it.

I congratulate the Senator from Oregon for what he has done. As I said to the Senator from Nevada, those of us with less seniority and less service on the committee, cannot help but be impressed by the attention and effort of the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Oregon who, hour after hour and day after day, without any attention, are trying to do something about the problems of the District. For those of us who are new to the Senate and to service on the committee to see that kind of dedication is the most impressive thing that I have seen so far.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from New York. No one in my experience, in serving on the subcommittee, has done a more effective job of cross-examining witnesses than has the Senator from New York, the former Attorney General of the United States. I believe that the record the Senator from New York made during the hearings in connection with crime in the District of Columbia will have more to do with our making a record of accomplishment this year than anything that has transpired in my subcommittee for a good many years.

What he has said is quite true. But we have the responsibility in Congress to come forward in support of any plan that is submitted to us which is borne out by the evidence. The Senator from New York is calling for the evidence and for the plan. I shall continue to support him in his drive for a cleanup of the situation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York for their remarks. I am delighted to hear the Senator from Oregon say that he is calling a meeting of his subcommittee next week. I trust that out of these hearings there may come a plan or pattern or procedure that will prevent, if not a recurrence of these crimes, at least a recurrence of the kind of treatment that victims of these crimes have been receiving.

I am glad that District of Columbia General has changed their procedures somewhat, but believe that there remains much room for further improvement.

For the Record
PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, President Johnson, in his remarks today, reaffirmed and indicated the continuation of essentially the same policy that has not thus far worked well in any respect. The policy pursued in Vietnam since 1954 has been a succession of mistakes, each of which has compounded the adverse consequences of its predecessors.

Upon his return from his most recent visit to Vietnam, the Secretary of Defense was quoted as saying that the situation there had deteriorated since his last visit approximately a year ago.

In fact, Mr. President, the situation in Vietnam is worse than it was 10 years ago; it is worse than it was 1 year ago, or 1 month ago. And it is worse today than it was 1 week ago.

In 1954, at the time of Dienbienphu, there were those who thought that the United States should have taken a direct and massive hand on behalf of the French in an effort to stave off the military and political defeat of France in Indochina. I was not among them. Nor was President Johnson.

It was my view, then, that such action would have been regarded as U.S. intervention in behalf of, and to preserve, the French colonialist policy of exploitation against which the people of southeast Asia were rebelling.

That would have been the effect of our intervention at that time.

Moreover, it seemed to me that our intervention with military action at that time would not be likely to change the result.

After 7 years of war with hundreds of thousands of French troops and massive U.S. economic and financial and logistic support, our allies, the French, suffered a costly defeat.

They learned that massive military operations conducted thousands of miles from their logistic base in the jungles and rice paddies of southeast Asia are not the answer to a problem that is to a large degree political, ideological, cultural, economic, religious, and racial in nature.

We now find ourselves involved in a war that defies analysis in traditional military terms; in a war that makes little sense as it is being waged; in a war that we have scant hope of winning except at a cost which far outweighs the fruits of victory; in a war fought on a battlefield suitable to the enemy, in a

17878

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 28, 1965

place and under conditions that no military man in his right mind would choose; in a war which threatens to escalate into a major power confrontation and which could escalate into nuclear holocaust.

I state this as a candid appraisal, with no intention to reflect upon those who have had the unhappy task of devising or implementing policy.

I fully sympathize with the President.

My lack of complete accord with his policy and action does not lessen that sympathy.

What has been done is done. We must now face the situation as it is rather than as we might wish it to be. A proper appraisal of the current situation requires a review of the major events over the past 11 years, during which time the nature and scope of our commitments to Vietnam have been developed. Later I shall undertake such a review.

For now, I wish to say that despite my bleak appraisal of the present situation, I took some heart and found some encouragement in President Johnson's statement today for the following reasons:

First, the President has apparently resisted the far greater degree of escalation that has been urged upon him.

Second, the President stopped short of accepting, or treating this as a American war. He showed an awareness of the fact that our policy has been, and, I am glad to say, still is, and I think should be, to assist the Vietnamese to win their own war. I believe the President showed a keen awareness of the danger of permitting the struggle to become an American war, a white man's war against Asia.

Third, by his increased emphasis upon the United Nations through his letter delivered today by Ambassador Goldberg to Mr. U Thant, the President demonstrated, it seemed to me, an awareness of the danger of isolating the United States in a land war in Asia and the danger of unifying the Communist world into monolithic unity by the landing of a major American expeditionary force in Asia.

Should this happen it might well be that we would not be permitted the luxury of concentrating most of our forces in Vietnam.

Indeed, on the floor earlier today the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] urged the transfer of troops from western Europe.

I am sure, in his careful review during the past several days, the President has carefully contemplated the danger of permitting the United States to be bogged down in an endless war in Asia, thus leaving the Soviets free to work their machinations in Latin America, in the Mediterranean Basin, in Europe, and perhaps elsewhere.

Assuming that no dramatic decisions have been reached which were not revealed to the American people today, I found encouragement and took heart at the President's statement.

I believe it indicates that he is approaching a most careful and pragmatic appraisal of the extremely dangerous situation which we face.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I know the hour is late. Earlier today, in the course of discussion between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the issue of civil rights was raised. The Senator from California said that in his opinion the Dirksen amendment did not involve a civil rights situation.

One of the finest statements made in this connection was made recently by Mr. Burke Marshall, who is extremely competent in this area. He was a top adviser to President Kennedy on civil rights.

He appeared before the subcommittee in opposition to this constitutional amendment a few weeks ago. I would like to read one paragraph from his statement:

These are some of the specific problems which are clearly discernible in the proposed amendments. But in conclusion, I would like to point out that the question goes far beyond mere technical underrepresentation of this one segment of the population. The question is whether or not the States will have political systems capable of action to meet the most urgent problems of our society, of which the most pressing and most difficult is that of low income Negroes and other nonwhites living in the blighted and congested parts of the urban centers. However the language of these proposed amendments is changed, they plainly contemplate the possibility of a malapportioned house in every State legislature which will at the very least have veto power over welfare, economic, educational, and civil rights measures aimed at remedying urban problems, and particularly the condition of the urban Negro. And if our experience in past years means anything, it is unrealistic to expect responsiveness to these needs by a legislative body whose members owe little or no political allegiance to the people in need of help.

In the course of the debate I asked the Senator from California about the situation in California and pointed out there was a heavy concentration of Negroes in every State who were terribly unrepresented. I notice in the statistics which Burke Marshall put in the record that 92 percent of the nonwhites in California live in cities. And it is an established fact that big city residents in California have a very feeble voice in the State legislature, in some cases less than 1 percent of the representation rural people have. What can this mean except that the Dirksen amendment is a civil rights issue because its passage would surely reduce the value of Negro votes in California as well as Mississippi.

In New York, 95 percent of the nonwhites live in urban areas; in Illinois, 97.5 percent live in the cities. It is obvious that if there is to be geographic representation in which small towns and rural areas are overrepresented, the mi-

nority groups may be very badly underrepresented, and their cause will not receive fair, just consideration.

I might also say that Mr. Marshall answered one other issue raised by the extremely able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who I think has done an excellent job for his side of the question throughout the hearings. He said:

I would say that basically it is unwise and undesirable to give the majority of the people the choice of whether or not they can deprive the minority of the people of some right, of a basic right to vote, and have an equal voice in their government.

This, of course, was the essence of the dispute between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] earlier today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Marshall, appearing on pages 852 through 865 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF BURKE MARSHALL

I appreciate the opportunity to testify in opposition the proposals to amend the Constitution to permit the States to abandon the principle of equality in selecting the members of one house of their legislatures. I shall try to be as brief as possible in stating my reasons.

I am an attorney presently engaged in the private practice of law. From February 1961 until January of this year, however, I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. The briefs filed expressing the views of the United States in the reapportionment cases originated in that Division and accordingly the position taken by the United States, supporting the constitutional views later adopted by the Supreme Court, was initially my responsibility. In addition, the major efforts of the Division during the past 4 years have been directed at insuring the Negro citizens of some of the States that they would be given the right freely to register and vote and accordingly to have a proportional voice in their State and local governments. I believe that the proposed amendments to the Constitution which are before this committee would seriously undercut those efforts, and it is to that aspect of this matter that I would like primarily to direct the committee's attention.

It seems to me that the proposed amendments carry a very heavy burden from the outset because they are the first serious proposals that I know of to amend the Constitution to eliminate, rather than to enhance, rights that are protected against State action by the Constitution, particularly the 14th and 15th amendments, and are in that sense guaranteed by the Constitution to the people.

Only the most compelling reasons could justify this kind of dilution of the right to equal protection of the laws which is now a right of all our citizens. What has happened since the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Baker v. Carr*, *Reynolds v. Sims*, and the other reapportionment cases, certainly does not furnish any such reasons. Those decisions have not created any constitutional crisis. Rather they have provided a stimulus for long-overdue corrective action by the States that at least moves in the direction of making their legislative bodies working institutions of government, capable of dealing with the problems of this century and the urbanization of our society.

July 28, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190004-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17883

composite judgment, then you are kind of getting away from the theory that the ultimate political authority in this Nation should be the people, are you not?

Mr. MARSHALL. Senator—no, Senator, I would not accept that.

I think that the idea, the principle which you are describing has as a premise that the people will have a decision to make: Are we going to count everyone's vote equally or are we not going to count everyone's vote equally?

Now, if it were put that simply and that clearly, I would not have much doubt about how the people would decide. The thing that I think is impossible is to require the States, the State legislatures, who are going to have an interest, after all, in preserving their own positions, to put the question that simply, or that easily.

Now, as I say, the question of multiple representatives is one thing. Another thing, there are undoubtedly other ways, other factors, which could be brought into the choice, which would distort the choice.

So I think that you cannot really assume, as a premise, when you are deciding whether or not you favor this constitutional amendment, Senator, that the choice put before the people will be as simple and as clearcut as the question suggests.

Senator HRUSKA. Of course that same result is suffered by legislative bodies every year in the history of our Republic, and is happening right now.

How often does our Senate, for example, or the House of Representatives get a clear choice of this or that? They don't get it. All of us know that.

In our process of government, that can never be attained, I don't believe. You have to approximate it. Certainly on the basis that you object to the voters acting on a matter of this kind, it would seem that you are denying the only avenue available for amending the Constitution. You see, without the proposed amendment they will never have an opportunity to change the structure of their own State legislatures.

Mr. MARSHALL. But, Senator, I would not want to rest my position just on what I said about the choice. That is a difficulty it seems to me, even accepting your premises instead of mine.

I would say that basically it is unwise and undesirable to give the majority of the people the choice of whether or not they can deprive the minority of the people of some right, of a basic right to vote, and have an equal voice in their government.

That seems to me to be wrong—to let the majority have that kind of a choice.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Chairman, I had other questions here. My respect for the witness is the highest. I have worked with him over a long period of time in other fields in this Senate. I would like to explore with him some of the other concepts that are advanced in his statement. However, the hour is getting late. We are going to adjourn the hearings, with today's hearings. There are one or two other witnesses.

Senator TYRINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Marshall. We appreciate your being with us.

We are very privileged to have the distinguished former Solicitor General of the United States, the Honorable J. Lee Rankin, native of Nebraska, practicing law in New York, Chief Counsel of the Warren Commission.

We appreciate your being with us very much, Mr. Rankin. You may proceed.

Senator HRUSKA. May I add my welcome to the distinguished witness, as a fellow native Nebraskan, Mr. Chairman. You have said so many nice things about him. While I can add to the list, I shan't do so at this time.

U.S. STRATEGY IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in his column published this morning in the Washington Post, Mr. Joseph Alsop very graphically pointed out one of the major shortcomings of U.S. strategy in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's column, entitled "More Trumpets for Jericho," be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Alsop points out that so far in Vietnam, our strategy has been like that of Joshua at Jericho, merely a parade of power without any effective use of it. He compares the targets struck by U.S. planes in North Vietnam to strikes limited by an enemy to West Virginia in the United States, where there are no strategic targets.

Events in the last few days have demonstrated that while the United States has been following the strategy of what Mr. Alsop appropriately calls "marching around the wall," the Communists have been building up a sophisticated defense with Russian-made weapons around the real military targets inside the wall. Rather than the two or four surface-to-air missile sites in North Vietnam, which the State and Defense Departments have publicly acknowledged, it now appears that there are at least 12 such sites. Yesterday the Defense Department released a map showing the location of seven of such missile sites. The map shows five sites ringed around Hanoi, and two sites west of Hanoi which our forces struck yesterday. As pointed out by the New York Times, the map does not show the five sites reported around the port of Haiphong.

These missile sites could have been bombed with very little risk to the attacking aircraft before they became operational, and such a course was urged by many responsible officials, reportedly including the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now that a decision has belatedly been made to strike the missile sites, as would appear to be the case from yesterday's air strikes on two of the sites, the cost in American lives and aircraft will be multiplied many times. This is one cost of "marching around the wall."

It has become crystal clear not only that the Communists are not going to be impressed by bugle blowing, but also that further persistence in such strategy is going to cost dearly in American lives.

The Communists will not relent until U.S. power is used effectively against the military targets in North Vietnam. We have been told repeatedly by the administration spokesmen that the men and equipment for and the direction of the aggression in South Vietnam are coming from North Vietnam. This war-making potential must be destroyed. It can be destroyed if our air and sea power are directed at the critical military targets in North Vietnam, most of which lie in the Red River Delta around Hanoi and the major North Vietnamese port of Haiphong.

No one desires to bomb population centers to destroy civilians. Our attacks should be concentrated to the maximum extent possible on military targets, rather than population centers as such. But we can no longer permit the heartland of North Vietnam to harbor the warmaking potential which, if it remains free from attack, can and will be used to inflict thousands of casualties on American men and our allies in South Vietnam.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1965]

MORE TRUMPETS FOR JERICHO?

(By Joseph Alsop)

The big question about the next phase in Vietnam is whether it is merely going to be a blown-up version of the phase now coming to a close.

Jericho is the only historical precedent for the phase of the Vietnamese war that is now ending. Joshua-Johnson has been marching around the ramparts, blowing his trumpets for might and main; but unfortunately he has had no help from tunnel-digging engineers, let alone a vengeful deity, to make the walls fall down on schedule.

In other words, this phase that began with the Pleiku incident has been marked by a maximum parade of power, and a minimum application of power. Huge enclaves of American troops and equipment have been built up along the coast of South Vietnam; but these American troops in the south have rarely been committed to any combat above the level of a local skirmish.

This has done much psychological-political harm, because of the stark contrast with the South Vietnamese Army, which is daily being heavily engaged and suffering really fearful casualties. And one may be sure that the mere parade of almost unused American power has made exactly the same impression on the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong as it has on the soldiers of the South Vietnamese army.

To be sure, Ambassador Maxwell Taylor strongly recommended that the U.S. units in South Vietnam be allowed at least 90 days to familiarize themselves with the terrain before being committed on a major scale. This may be the explanation of the limited use made of these units up to now. Hence, the pattern of the bombing of North Vietnam is much more instructive.

Concerning the trifling tit-for-tat after the summer episode in the Gulf of Tonkin, the President is widely quoted as boasting, in effect, that he had made a eunuch of Ho Chi Minh. Beginning with the Pleiku incident, U.S. planes have now been bombing North Vietnamese targets for nearly 6 months, and the claims made for this bombing are about on a par with the President's post-Tonkin Gulf boast.

Here it is necessary to explain something of the geography of North Vietnam. The heart of the country is the rice-producing Red River Delta—the region around Hanoi and Haiphong, west of Hanoi to the Laos border, there is an underpopulated mountainous area, where it is only possible to grow the poverty crops and opium. And south along the coast, to the demilitarized zone, there extends another long, narrow finger of territory without much relevance to the rest of the country.

The mountain region west of Hanoi and the southern coastal finger are both comparable with West Virginia, if one wants to get the relationship right. We should be indignant, humiliated, what you will, if an enemy bombed West Virginia's bridges, railroads, and roads.

But in the end, we would certainly not be alarmed—we might even begin to laugh in

17884

our sleeves—if a powerful enemy made all sorts of statements about his bloody boldness and iron resolution, and then just went on bombing West Virginia, day after day after day.

Until very recently, that is what has been happening. The attacks in February were trifling. The tempo of attacks did not really pick up until April and May. It was not until June that the first, very tentative attacks were made outside the West Virginia-like area. It was not until July that the first tentative missions were directed against element of the major target systems in the North Vietnamese heartland. Even now, the heartland has not really been penetrated.

We are being told by people who do not know the geography and have not studied the target-patterns that "bombing the North is useless." The answer is that the North has not really been bombed as yet—not for the purpose of destroying the population, but simply to take out the significant military target systems.

The air mission that evoked a missile-response was one of the first dozen or so that probed for anything really vital beyond the West Virginia-like region.

In an interview given to "Newsweek," the President recently said that the United States needs "power on land, power in the air, power wherever it's necessary. We've got to commit it, and this will convince them we mean it." Unhappily, "they" were supposed to be convinced by the show-bombings of the North and the earlier movements of U.S. troops into South Vietnam.

No one can tell, therefore, whether the President now intends an even more showy parade of power, with continued minimum application of this power. This time, it seems likely, Lyndon Johnson really means business. If he does not however, the darkest news must be expected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 2984. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2985. An act to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7984. An act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; and

H.J. Res. 591. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 29, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 27), 1965:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public

Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant veterinary officer
Stephen Potkay

II. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant surgeon

Francisco Frias

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Paul D. Eckrich	Kenneth J.
Alan C. Foose	Kronovetor
Barry L. Johnson	Russell S. Lo Galbo

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Elmer W. Akin	Michael J. Kopcho
Robert Brotman	Jeremiah R. Toomay
Jean P. Davignon	

To be senior assistant scientist

John J. Bartko

To be senior assistant therapist

Dale E. Swett

To be health services officer

Clifton R. Gravelle

To be senior assistant health services officer

Gregory J. Barone	Kenneth D. Howard
Wayne G. Brown	Thomas J. Keast

To be assistant sanitary engineer

John F. Walsh

To be nurse director

Mary E. O'Connor

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Abe Fortas, of Tennessee, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Arthur J. Goldberg.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 27), 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman. I want to correct an impression that might have been left that the administration, particularly through the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, is favorable to placing these lines underground. The lines involved here are not distribution lines, which it would cost about \$50,000 a mile to put underground. These are very-high-tension, 220-kilovolt lines that carry a tremendous powerload. It is not feasible to put them underground.

I might add that in the opinion of the court mentioned by the gentleman from California it places the Atomic Energy Commission in a very unenviable position, being the only department or agency of Government which could not build these lines despite a local ordinance simply because the Atomic Energy Act was written, we hope, at the time carefully to make sure that the sale of power which comes out of a nuclear reactor that the Commission licenses should be under local ordinances and rules and regulations.

That clause was interpreted to mean that the AEC had to be under local laws and regulations as to buying power to bring into its facilities, which was not intended by Congress.

The bill is designed for the purposes of placing the AEC on a par with all other agencies and departments of Government.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

(Mr. YOUNGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the House should understand thoroughly what this amendment would do. Before section 271 provided:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the authority or regulations of any Federal, State, or local agency with respect to the generation, sale, and transmission of electric power.

Now they seek to amend the section, and what would they do?

It reads:

Provided, That this section shall not be deemed to confer upon any Federal, State, or local agency any authority to regulate, control, or restrict any activities of the Commission.

That goes far beyond the right of any other Federal agency. They can go into a community and they can violate the safety laws. They can violate the health laws. They can do anything they want to under this amendment, and pay no respect whatsoever to any local agency.

Let me tell the Members something about local agencies which are interested in this.

In southern California, there is the Nuclear Power for Progress Citizens Committee. The AEC is attempting to put a nuclear powerplant in Corral Canyon in the Malibu area.

The letter says:

Opponents of the project, chiefly in the Malibu area, have been articulate in expressing their views.

But, under the amendment they will have no power whatsoever to prevent the AEC from establishing that facility in their territory.

I have here a letter from the National Association of Sanitarians. They point out the increase in the incidence of leukemia and cancer along the Columbia River and in Portland due to the fact that the radioisotopes from the Hanford plant are seeping into the Columbia River. They offer a protest to that.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. No, I do not yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the "Oregon Malignancy Pattern Physiographically Related to Hanford, Wash., Radioisotope Storage" be printed in the Record at this point.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is exactly the way the AEC is doing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman's request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is the way the AEC has been operating, continuously overriding anything that a local agency wants to do. They feel that the power of the Federal Government is supreme, that the local agency has no power whatsoever. They feel they can do anything in regard to the health of the people and not be accountable to any local agency at all.

I have another matter here, so far as beautification is concerned. This is from the city of Claremont, in southern California. This is a letter they have written to the President:

Your efforts to crystallize the awareness of people throughout the Nation on the need for beautification is greatly appreciated by the city of Claremont. We agree that a larger portion of the country's national income can be channeled into eliminating manmade ugliness—with noble purpose—to uplift the spirit of man.

Perhaps the greatest blight on today's urban landscape is the 75-year accumulation of overhead electrical transmission and distribution lines.

Yet the city of Claremont, if this amendment passes, will have no authority whatsoever to interfere with anything that the AEC might do, because under this amendment for which they are asking there is no activity of the AEC that can be subject to any State, local, or city ordinance of any kind.

Recently there was a question of the business people trying to beautify their localities. The local zoning ordinance under Federal pressure will bear down on unsightly and drab business. Secondly, which business will go along with the idea to get Small Business Administration loans which they otherwise might not get. So the Federal Government, in order to beautify independent business locations, is now willing to loan

the business people money to beautify their locations, and it is under Federal pressure that that is being done. However, here we have a Federal agency which goes into the territory of a community and violates an ordinance and violates the county restrictions, because both the county, Menlo Park, and Woodside have all passed resolutions against this overhead line. I do not believe that even if this amendment is passed it will have anything whatsoever to do with the Woodside location, but if you want to vote against this, your vote may save your own district. I do not think that this act can have anything to do with what the court already said. I am advised by the attorney who beat the AEC in the circuit court by a unanimous opinion that if they go back into court, they have to go back under the law that they went in on. If they want to start a new suit, then they can take advantage of this law. However, that will take about 2 years. We will cover all of this tomorrow. I am just taking this time to give you a little bit of an idea so that you can study it tonight and ask for this report and study this amendment and see what the AEC is really attempting to do to the States and local communities of this country.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to proceed out of order.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the President made a historic announcement which shows the enormity of his compassion for peace. The President had served notice on the Communists in Vietnam that we are not going to be driven out of Vietnam. He has fortified that decision by sending additional troops there, but at the same time Mr. Johnson has asked the Security Council of the United Nations to explore every single avenue and every single possible way of resolving the conflict in Vietnam. I think that the President's decision today should be a source of great hope for all Americans, because it shows while the President is not going to yield to communism in Vietnam, at the same time the President is doing everything he can to explore every possible way of resolving the conflict in Vietnam without any escalation.

I think the action of Mr. Johnson today should also be a source of great hope for those who have voiced a great desire that the war not be escalated. I think this is the road to peace and I think it is the road to victory for freedom in Vietnam. I congratulate the President for his forthright position.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take time now to argue the merits of this resolution. The gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] is appallingly misinformed as to the intent of the resolution. The provision he refers to merely is a statement that section 271 does not confer upon any Federal, State, or local agency the right to regulate or control.

17954

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 28, 1965

Those rules and regulations which exist now in other acts, of course, still exist. But this particular section does not confer any new or additional authority. Of course, this has nothing to do with health and the other matters which the gentleman mentioned in his statement, which was one of the most misinformed statements on the intent of the legislation that I have ever heard. I do not intend to argue the case; we will argue it tomorrow on the floor of the House. Adequate time will be given to both the proponents and opponents to state their positions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 486, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 486

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]. Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H.R. 8310, with 2 hours of general debate. It is an open rule. It has to do with amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. I know of no basic objections to the rule, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. This is an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 8310, the extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This is a 3-year extension, but only a 1-year authorization. It is a little difficult to follow the bill, from my standpoint, to establish actually the exact amount of money involved. If I have added up my figures correctly, it looks like \$385 million for next year, about \$461 million for the fiscal year 1967, and approximately \$526 million for the fiscal year 1968 which, for the 3 years, makes a total of \$1,372 billion.

But, as I have already said, this is a 3-year extension of the act, but only a 1-year authorization of money.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fine program. They expect to rehabilitate some 200,000 people this year. I approve the program. I know of no objections to the rule, and I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNIST-BACKED STUDENT NONVIOLENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE PLANS TO SEIZE CHAMBER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON MONDAY, AUGUST 9, TO PROTEST THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION IN VIETNAM

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, two nationally syndicated columns have reported recently on the plans of the Communist-backed Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee to seize this Chamber Monday, August 9, to protest the President's position in Vietnam. If this disgrace is allowed to come about, if this hallowed Chamber is turned into a Roman arena for a sounding board for the propaganda of this rabble group, the dignity of this House will have sunk to a nadir never before suffered and from which it can never completely recover.

This so-called committee is not a committee, it is a mob. It contains no students, only radical, Communist-infiltrated gangs of agitators. It is not nonviolent, but dedicated to violence for the sake of the party line.

It is well known that Snick gets its funds from the Southern Conference Education Fund, a cited Communist front, operated by Anne and Carl Braden, both of whom have been identified in sworn testimony as Communists.

Their plan to seize the floor of the House on August 9 must be thwarted no matter what the cost. I call upon the Members of the House to protest this plot and unite in whatever action is necessary to meet this threat to the sanctity of this Chamber.

For the benefit of anyone who may have missed these two columns when they first appeared, I call attention to the first, by Victor Riesel, of July 15, and the second, by Evans and Novak, of July 27.

[From the Shreveport Journal, July 15, 1965]

LEFTWING PLANS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Soon the August 9 movement will smash its way into the Nation's headlines. On that day it will attempt to occupy the Chamber of Congress, House of Representatives here.

On that day a coalition of leftwing unionists, young workers recruited from big factories, poverty actionists from the big cities, students' leaders, pacifists, and the vacationing campus anti-Vietnam leaders will move into the Capitol Building.

They will lead an attempt to walk around the House Chamber. Then the action blueprint calls for a sudden dive for empty seats of Congressmen who are off the floor. Many of them will be, since August 9 is a summer Monday.

Realizing there will be police action, leaders of the newly-coordinated movement which will be known as WAP—Washington Action Project—plan to sit down wherever they are stopped. There they intend to remain until dragged out and arrested.

August 9, 1965, may yet be heralded in some corners of the world as the day the proletariat arose and attempted to seize the American Congress.

However, the WAP's intent is to sit down in the House seats, convene a congress of unrepresented people and call for "peace" in Vietnam.

Previous to the planned invasion of Congress—all of which is being carefully developed in an office on Rhode Island Avenue here—there will be a day-long series of workshops.

What makes this operation a significant development in the so-called peace movement is the presence of a leftwing unionist in the 30-man WAP coordinating committee. He's Russ Nixon, who has powerful connections in a series of militant, independent labor unions. His contacts reach into unions covering plants in the electronic, electrical, and atomic equipment and communication fields and on some waterfronts.

Nixon, an accomplished organizer and strategist, is counted on to bring in the manpower which the peace groups have lacked. Apparently there are sufficient funds. Staffs are maintained. Considerable lodging is supplied.

But numbers are needed for the series of picket lines and mass demonstrations now planned on a front stretching from the Pentagon on to the White House, then up Pennsylvania Avenue into the Congress itself.

The next step, it is believed by security people, will be attempts to move into arms factories and industrial plants providing the logistic support for the Vietnamese fighting.

If thousands of workers—especially young people now entering the labor market—can be convinced that it is wrong to produce for war, there could be sizable demonstrations in and outside the plant gates of key mills and factories.

Plant security directors and industrial-labor relations men, working closely with non-left union chiefs, have observed the spreading influence in labor of anti-Vietnamists. Already a large Midwest local of a huge national union has permitted its publication to state that American generals are gleefully permitting our troops to shoot colored people in Asia by the thousands.

Such growing infiltration could have its impact on America even if just a handful of workers take the propaganda seriously.

That August 9 movement could really touch things off that morning.

THE MOSES RALLY

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just how far militant elements of the civil rights movement have been sidetracked from

July 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17955

their proper course soon will be seen in a civil disobedience rally against the war in Vietnam.

Unpublicized so far, an "Assembly of Unrepresented People to Declare Peace" is planned for August 6-9 in Washington (coinciding with the 20th anniversary of atomic attacks on Japan.)

A two-page flyer privately distributed to possible participants minces no words about the true purpose of the assembly—to get antiwar protesters arrested at the door of the White House and the Capitol.

But most interesting about the flyer is the identification of the assembly headquarters as 107 Rhode Island Avenue NW., in Washington. For this is the office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (Snick), which is supposed to be concerned almost wholly with civil rights and not at all with foreign policy.

Moreover, the flyer says correspondence should be directed to the Rhode Island Avenue address in care of Bob Parris. This is none other than Robert Moses, who gained a nationwide reputation as the mystical and eloquent leader of Snick's Mississippi summer project of 1964 (then left Mississippi and started using his middle name of "Parris" to prevent development of a personality cult.)

Though he now holds no Snick office, Moses remains its inspirational leader—embodying Snick's most disturbing tendencies. (For instance, liberals remain dismayed by Moses' collaboration with such tired old figure of the far left as Russ Nixon, general manager of the Communist National Guardian (who has helped plan the Aug. 6-9 assembly).)

Far more disturbing than Moses' alliances is his view that couples white racism in Mississippi with the campaign against Communist terrorists in Vietnam. An admiring article in the Nation quotes Moses as contending that the 1964 murder of civil rights workers in Mississippi "is related to napalm bombing of objects in Vietnam."

Moses' objectives are spelled out in the two-page flyer.

On August 6 (anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing) protestors will gather at the White House. It is added cryptically: "There may be nonviolent civil disobedience by a small number of the signers who will seek to present the declaration (refusing to cooperate in carrying out the war in Vietnam) to the President." This is only a tame prelude to August 9 (the anniversary of the Nagasaki bombing). "Those members of the assembly of unrepresented people in a position to face possible arrest and willing to pledge themselves to nonviolent behavior . . . will assemble and walk toward the Capitol with the intention of convening the assembly in the Chamber of the House of Representatives and thus deny that Congress has the right to declare war in our names."

The inevitable result: Mass arrests, police dragging away demonstrators and (though this is not the intention of many demonstrators) fuel for the Communist propaganda mills.

The broader-range result is increased entanglement of Snick from civil rights moderates. Indeed, by its own radicalism, Snick has so isolated itself that it is starving to death.

Foundations, labor unions, and other liberal organizations have quietly choked off funds to Snick, which cannot now meet its meager payroll. Snick's remaining white liberal friends are finding it hard to raise a few thousand dollars this summer.

But this should be no cause for joy by respectable liberals. For Snick's steady movement toward the far left and oblivion is a tragedy for the civil rights movement. Conceived spontaneously during the 1960 sit-

ins, Snick is the one civil rights organization that consistently has appeal for idealistic youth.

Furthermore, the lethargic civil rights summer in the South can be attributed partly to the defection of Snick's militants by fringe civil rights issues (notably the quixotic effort to unseat Mississippi's Congressmen) and noncivil rights issues.

Unhappily, with the civil rights movement in the doldrums in the Deep South, the main target for Bob Moses and his civil rights militants is Lyndon Johnson's foreign policy.

ATOMIC DIPLOMACY: HIROSHIMA AND POTSDAM

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a new book, entitled "Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam," was published by Simon & Schuster. The author is Gar Alperovitz, who formerly served as a legislative assistant to a Member of the House and is presently legislative director under a Member of the Senate.

The book is an account of the influence of the first atomic bomb upon American diplomacy in 1945. It also attempts to examine available evidence on the decision to use the bomb, but it reaches no final answers on this matter, concluding that further information is needed before a firm conclusion can be reached.

The book in its original form won the author his doctorate at the University of Cambridge in England. He is on the faculty of King's College, Cambridge, but is on leave to work in the Senate. The book is a serious study about an extremely important matter, and I believe other Members will be interested in an article based upon it, and in a number of early reviews it has received.

The article and reviews follow:

[From the Progressive, August 1965]

TWENTY YEARS AFTER HIROSHIMA: WHY WE DROPPED THE BOMB

(By Gar Alperovitz)

(This article is adapted from Gar Alperovitz' "Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam," just published by Simon & Schuster. In the book the author uses some 1,400 citations to document the thesis emphasized in the article below. Much of "Atomic Diplomacy" is based on previously unpublished portions of the diaries of the late Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew, and Adm. William D. Leahy, who was Chief of Staff to President Truman. Mr. Alperovitz is an American Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, England, who is now on leave as legislative director for Senator GAYLORD A. NELSON, of Wisconsin. Mr. Alperovitz served as special consultant in the preparation of the recent NBC white paper, "The Decision To Use the Atomic Bomb."—The Editors.)

President TRUMAN.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I think it is very important that I should have a talk with you as soon as possible on a highly secret matter. I mentioned it to you shortly after you took office, but have not urged it since on account of the pressure you have been under. It, however, has such a bearing on our present foreign relations and has such an important effect upon all my thinking in

this field that I think you ought to know about it without much further delay.

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

APRIL 24, 1945.

This note was written 12 days after Franklin Delano Roosevelt's death and 2 weeks before World War II ended in Europe. The following day Secretary Stimson advised President Truman that the "highly secret matter" would have a decisive effect upon America's postwar foreign policy. Stimson then outlined the role the atomic bomb would play in America's relations with other countries. In diplomacy, he confided to his diary, the weapon would be a master card.

In the spring of 1945, postwar problems unfolded as rapidly as the Allied armies converged in central Europe. During the fighting which preceded Nazi surrender the Red army conquered a great belt of territory bordering the Soviet Union. Debating the consequences of this fact, American policymakers defined a series of interrelated problems: What political and economic pattern was likely to emerge in eastern and central Europe? Would Soviet influence predominate? Most important, what power—if any—did the United States have to effect the ultimate settlement on the very borders of Russia?

Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin had attempted to resolve these issues of East-West influence at the February 1945, Yalta Conference. With the Red army clearly in control of Eastern Europe, the West was in a weak bargaining position. It was important to reach an understanding with Stalin before American troops began their planned withdrawal from the European Continent. Poland, the first major country intensely discussed by the Big Three, took on unusual significance; the balance of influence struck between Soviet-oriented and Western-oriented politicians in the Government of this one country could set a pattern for big-power relationships in the rest of Eastern Europe.

Although the Yalta Conference ended with a signed accord covering Poland, within a few weeks it was clear that allied understanding was more apparent than real. None of the heads of government interpreted the somewhat vague agreement in the same way. Churchill began to press for more Western influence; Stalin urged less. True to his well-known policy of cooperation and conciliation, Roosevelt attempted to achieve a more definite understanding for Poland and a pattern for East-West relations in Europe. Caught for much of the last of his life between the determination of Churchill and the stubbornness of Stalin, Roosevelt at times fired off angry cables to Moscow, and at others warned London against an "attempt to evade the fact that we placed, as clearly shown in the agreement, somewhat more emphasis . . . [on Soviet-oriented Polish politicians in the government]."

President Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, only 2 months after Yalta. When President Truman met with Secretary Stimson to discuss the "bearing" of the atomic bomb upon foreign relations, the powers were deeply ensharled in a tense public struggle over the meaning of the Yalta agreement. Poland had come to symbolize all East-West relations. Truman was forced to pick up the tangled threads of policy with little knowledge of the broader, more complex issues involved.

Herbert Fels, a noted expert on the period, has written that "Truman made up his mind that he would not depart from Roosevelt's course or renounce his ways." Others have argued that "we tried to work out the problems of peace in close cooperation with the Russians." It is often believed that Ameri-

can policy followed a conciliatory course, changing—in reaction to Soviet intransigence—only in 1947 with the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan. My own belief is somewhat different. It derives from the comment of Mr. Truman's Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, that by early autumn of 1945 it was "understandable" that Soviet leaders should feel American policy had shifted radically after Roosevelt's death. It is now evident that, far from following his predecessor's policy of cooperation, shortly after taking office President Truman launched a powerful foreign policy initiative aimed at reducing or eliminating Soviet influence in Europe.

The ultimates point of this study is not, however, that America's approach to Russia changed after Roosevelt. Rather it is that the atomic bomb played a role in the formulation of policy, particularly in connection with President Truman's only meeting with Stalin, the Potsdam Conference of late July and early August 1945. Again, my judgment differs from Felt's conclusion that "the light of this explosion 'brighter than a thousand suns' filtered into the conference rooms at Potsdam only as a distant gleam." I believe new evidence proves not only that the atomic bomb influenced diplomacy, but that it determined much of Mr. Truman's shift to a tough policy aimed at forcing Soviet acquiescence to American plans for Eastern and central Europe.

The weapon gave him an entirely new feeling of confidence, the President told his Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. By the time of Potsdam, Mr. Truman had been advised on the role of the atomic bomb by both Secretary Stimson and Secretary of State Byrnes. Though the two men differed as to tactics, each urged a tough line. Part of my study attempts to define how closely Truman followed a subtle policy outlined by Stimson, and to what extent he followed the straightforward advice of Byrnes that the bomb (in Mr. Truman's words) "put us in a position to dictate our own terms at the end of the war."

Stalin's approach seems to have been cautiously moderate during the brief few months here described. It is perhaps symbolized by the Soviet-sponsored free elections which routed the Communist Party in Hungary in the autumn of 1945. I do not attempt to interpret this moderation, nor to explain how or why Soviet policy changed to the harsh totalitarian controls characteristic of the period after 1946.

The judgment that Truman radically altered Roosevelt's policy in mid-1945 nevertheless obviously suggests a new point of departure for interpretations of the cold war. In late 1945, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower observed in Moscow that "before the atom bomb was used, I would have said, yes, I was sure we could keep the peace with Russia. Now I don't know. . . . People are frightened and disturbed all over. Everyone feels insecure again." To what extent did postwar Soviet policies derive from in security based upon a fear of America's atom bomb and changed policy? I stop short of this fundamental question, concluding that further research is needed to test Secretary Stimson's judgment that "the problem of our satisfactory relations with Russia [was] not merely connected with but [was] virtually dominated by the problem of the atomic bomb."

Similarly, I believe more research and more information are needed to reach a conclusive understanding of why the atomic bomb was used. The common belief is that the question is closed, and that President Truman's explanation is correct: "The dropping of the bombs stopped the war, saved millions of lives." My own view is that available evidence shows the atomic bomb was not needed to end the war or to save lives—and that

this was understood by American leaders at the time.

General Eisenhower recently recalled that in mid-1945 he expressed a similar opinion to the Secretary of War: "I told him I was against it on two counts. First, the Japanese were ready to surrender and it wasn't necessary to hit them with that awful thing. Second, I hated to see our country be the first to use such a weapon * * *." To go beyond the limited conclusion that the bomb was unnecessary is not possible at present.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the decision to use the atomic bomb is that this President and his senior political advisers do not seem ever to have shared Eisenhower's "grave misgivings." They simply assumed that they would use the bomb, never really giving serious consideration to not using it. Hence, to state in a precise way the question, "Why was the atomic bomb used?" is to ask why senior political officials did not seriously question its use, as General Eisenhower did.

The first point to note is that the decision to use the weapon did not derive from overriding military considerations. Despite Mr. Truman's subsequent statement that the weapon "saved millions of lives," Eisenhower's judgment that it was "completely unnecessary" as a measure to save lives was almost certainly correct. This is not a matter of hindsight; before the atomic bomb was dropped each of the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised that it was highly likely that Japan could be forced to surrender "unconditionally," without use of the bomb and without an invasion. Indeed, this characterization of the position taken by the senior military advisers is a conservative one.

Gen. George C. Marshall's June 18 appraisal was the most cautiously phrased advice offered by any of the Joint Chiefs: "The impact of Russian entry on the already hopeless Japanese may well be the decisive action levering them into capitulation * * *." Adm. William D. Leahy was absolutely certain there was no need for the bombing to obviate this necessity of an invasion. His judgment after the fact was the same as his view before the bombing: "It is my opinion that the use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender * * *." Similarly, through most of 1945, Adm. Ernest J. King believed the bomb unnecessary, and Gens. Henry H. Arnold and Curtis E. LeMay defined the official Air Force position in this way: Whether or not the atomic bomb should be dropped was not for the Air Force to decide, but explosion of the bomb was not necessary to win the war or make an invasion unnecessary.

Similar views prevailed in Britain long before the bombs were used. General Hastings Ismay recalls that by the time of Potsdam, "for some time past it had been firmly fixed in my mind that the Japanese were tottering." Ismay's reaction to the suggestion of the bombing was, like Eisenhower's and Leahy's, one of "revulsion." And Churchill, who as early as September 1944, felt that Russian entry into the war with Japan was likely to force capitulation, had written: "It would be a mistake to suppose that the fate of Japan was settled by the atomic bomb. Her defeat was certain before the first bomb fell."

The military appraisals made before the weapons were used have been confirmed by numerous postsurrender studies. The best known is that of the U.S. strategic bombing survey. The survey's conclusion is unequivocal: "Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped, even if Russia had not entered the war, and even if no invasion had been planned or contemplated."

That military considerations were not decisive is confirmed—and illuminated—by the fact that the President did not even ask the

opinion of the military adviser most directly concerned. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in the Pacific, was simply informed of the weapon shortly before it was used at Hiroshima. Before his death he stated on numerous occasions that, like Eisenhower, he believed the atomic bomb was completely unnecessary from a military point of view.

Although military considerations were not primary, unquestionably political considerations related to Russia played a major role in the decision; from at least mid-May in 1945, American policymakers hoped to end the hostilities before the Red army entered Manchuria. For this reason they had no wish to test whether Russian entry into the war would force capitulation—as most thought likely—long before the scheduled November Allied invasion of Japan. Indeed, they actively attempted to delay Stalin's declaration of war.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to conclude that the atomic bomb was used simply to keep the Red army out of Manchuria. Given the desperate efforts of the Japanese to surrender, and President Truman's willingness to offer assurances to the Emperor, it is entirely possible that the war could have been ended by negotiation before the Red army had begun its attack. But after history's first atomic explosion at Alamogordo neither the President nor his senior political advisers were interested in exploring this possibility.

One reason may have been their fear that if time-consuming negotiations were once initiated, the Red army might attack in order to seize Manchurian objectives. But, if this explanation is accepted, once more one must conclude that the bomb was used primarily because it was felt to be politically important to prevent Soviet domination of the area.

Such a conclusion is difficult to accept, for American interests in Manchuria, although historically important to the State Department, were not of great significance. The further question, therefore, arises: Were there other political reasons for using the atomic bomb? In approaching this question, it is important to note that most of the men involved at the time who since have made their views public always mention two considerations which dominated discussions. The first was the desire to end the Japanese war quickly, which was not primarily a military consideration, but a political one. The second is always referred to indirectly.

In June, for example, a leading member of President Truman's Advisory Interim Committee's scientific panel, A. H. Compton, advised against the Franck report's suggestion of a technical demonstration of the new weapon: Not only was there a possibility that this might not end the war promptly, but failure to make a combat demonstration would mean the "loss of the opportunity to impress the world with the national sacrifices that enduring security demanded." The general phrasing that the bomb was needed "to impress the world" has been made more specific by J. Robert Oppenheimer. Testifying on this matter some years later he stated that the second of the two "overriding considerations" in discussions regarding the bomb was "the effect of our actions on the stability, on our strength, and the stability of the postwar world." And the problem of postwar stability was inevitably the problem of Russia. Oppenheimer has put it this way: "Much of the discussion revolved around the question raised by Secretary Stimson as to whether there was any hope at all of using this development to get less barbarous relations with the Russians."

Vannevar Bush, Stimson's chief aid for atomic matters, has been quite explicit: "That bomb was developed on time. * * *." Not only did it mean a quick end to the

standing public servant, who has served the Congress and the Nation in the highest traditions of the office which he has held. I hope that he may enjoy prosperity, success, and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I desire to join the gentleman from New York and all others who have spoken on the subject of the retirement of Comptroller General Joseph Campbell.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Campbell. He is a dedicated public servant, a man of unquestioned integrity. I deeply regret that he is leaving Government service for there is no question that he and the employees of his agency have been instrumental in preventing the waste of untold millions of dollars.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] has so well said, and unlike some other agencies and departments, when communications are addressed to him by Members of Congress they bring an immediate response. This has been my experience in writing to him to obtain information.

My great hope is that the present President of the United States will name a successor of the character, integrity and dedication of Mr. Joseph Campbell. The citizens of this country have every right to expect that in the filling of this vacancy, the President will lay aside political considerations and select a Comptroller General who will administer the General Accounting Office on the same high standard as that set by Mr. Campbell, who, I say again, leaves an unquestioned record of honorable and competent service to his Government.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I am sure we could pay no greater tribute to this man than to express the hope that this position will continue to be filled by men of his integrity and ability.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks commemorating the service of and paying tribute to the character of this outstanding public servant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. Albert PRESIDENTIAL NEWS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of the House joined millions of Americans across the Nation in witnessing the televised proceedings

of President Johnson's news conference today.

The President opened his remarks with a restatement of the Nation's commitment in Vietnam. The South Vietnamese people have asked our assistance in resisting Communist domination. We have said to these people, as we have said to others, that we will do what is necessary to see that their struggle succeeds.

It has become necessary to commit U.S. forces to achieve this end. For us to decline to make this commitment would be to abandon the South Vietnamese to Communist control. For us to fail to meet the commitment entirely would be to fail the 70,000 or 80,000 American boys who are already fighting and assisting the South Vietnamese people. Such an abandonment would say to other nations that our pledged word in the face of Communist aggression is good—but only up to a point. Faith in the value of our word would be seriously weakened, most immediately in southeast Asia but also in the rest of Asia and throughout the world.

Such an abandonment would say to the other Communist nations that if the United States is pushed hard enough, it will back off from its firm commitments. It would give to those Communist leaders who are closely watching the Vietnam conflict the green light to initiate subversive aggression against their neighbors. We would then be faced with choosing to fight in a number of places or in choosing to accept a growing number of implacably hostile regimes much closer to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has considered every possible course of action in reaching the conclusions which he has announced to the American people. He has sought, and he has had the advice of, many Americans in all walks of life—he has consulted with former President Eisenhower, Members of Congress, and high diplomatic and military officials of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new in the course which the President has taken. There is nothing inconsistent in what the President has said. There is nothing which changes our policy. The door to discussions is still open. The door to negotiations is still open. Peace is still our goal—honorable, lasting, and just peace. This is our purpose, and the President has made this abundantly clear. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that an overwhelming majority of Americans support President Johnson in his conduct of American forces and policies in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the Record I may include the text of the statements issued by the President today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Not long ago I received a letter from a woman in the Midwest. She wrote:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my humble way I am writing to you about the crisis in Vietnam * * *. I have a son who is now in Vietnam. My husband served * * * in World War II * * *. Our country was at war, but now this time it's something I don't understand, why?"

I have tried to answer that question a dozen times and more. I have discussed it fully in Baltimore in April, in Washington in May, and in San Francisco in June. Let me now discuss it again. Why must young Americans—born into a land exultant with hope and golden with promise—toll and suffer and sometimes die in such a remote and distant place.

The answer, like the war itself, is not easy. But it echoes clearly from the painful lessons of half a century. Three times in my lifetime—in two World Wars and in Korea—Americans have gone to far lands to fight. We have learned—at a terrible and brutal cost—that retreat does not bring safety, or weakness bring peace.

It is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam.

This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam—at times with understandable grievances—have joined in the attack on their own government. But we must not let this mask the central fact: This is a war. It is guided by North Vietnam and spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the South, defeat American power, and extend the Asiatic dominion of communism.

And there are great stakes in the balance.

Most of the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot, by themselves, resist the growing might and grasping ambition of Asian communism. Our power is a vital shield. If we are driven from the field in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise or protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. And an Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself.

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate. But there is no one else.

Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace. We learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another; bringing with it, perhaps, even larger and crueler conflict.

Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents, over 11 years, have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation. Strengthened by that promise the people of South Vietnam have fought for many years. Thousands have died, and thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. We cannot now dishonor our word, abandon our commitment, and leave those who trusted us to terror and repression and murder.

This then is why we are in Vietnam.

What are our goals in that war-stained land?

First, we intend to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms.

They are not easily convinced. In recent months they have increased their fighting forces and their attacks. I have asked the commanding general—General Westmoreland—what more he needs to meet mounting aggression. He has told me. And we will meet his needs.

I have today ordered to Vietnam the air mobile division, and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 120,000 men. Additional forces will be needed later and they will be sent. This will make it necessary to increase our active fighting forces by raising the monthly draft

17966

call from 17,000—which it now is—to 35,000; and stepping up our campaign for voluntary enlistments.

After this past week of deliberations, I have concluded it is not essential to order reserve units into service. If that necessity should later be indicated I will give the matter careful consideration and I will give the country due and adequate notice before acting.

We have also discussed with the Government of South Vietnam the steps they will take to substantially increase their own efforts—on the battlefield and toward reform and progress in the villages.

I have directed Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara to be available immediately to review these moves with appropriate congressional committees. I have asked them to be available to answer the questions of any Member of Congress. And Secretary McNamara in addition will ask the Senate Appropriations Committee to add a limited amount to present legislation to help meet part of this new cost, until a supplemental measure is ready, and hearings can be held, when the Congress assembles in January.

These steps, like our actions in the past, are carefully measured to do what must be done to bring about an end to aggression and a peaceful settlement. We do not want an expanding struggle, with consequences no one can foresee. Nor will we bluster or bully or flaunt our power.

But we will not surrender. And we will not retreat.

For behind our pledge lies the determination and resources of the American Nation.

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution will be inevitable.

We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table. I have stated publicly, and many times, our willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place. Fifteen efforts have been made to start discussions. But there has been no answer.

But we will persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at so much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the Government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposals. We are ready to discuss their proposals, and our proposals, and any proposal of any government whose people may be affected.

For we fear the meetingroom no more than we fear the battlefield.

In this pursuit, we welcome, and ask for, the concern and assistance of any nation. If the United Nations, its officials, or any one of its 114 members can—by deed or word, private initiative or public action—bring us toward an honorable peace then they will have the support of the United States of America.

I have directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York immediately and present to the Secretary General a letter from me requesting that all the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and bring peace in Vietnam.

For we do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of territory. But we insist, and we will always insist, that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right to shape their own destiny in free elections—in the south or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision—and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror. This was the purpose of the 1954 agreements which the Communists have cruelly shattered. And if the machinery of those agreements was tragically weak, its purposes are still our own.

And as battle rages we will continue, as best we can, to help the people of South Vietnam enrich the condition of their life—to feed the hungry, tend the sick, teach the young, shelter the homeless, help the farmer to grow his crops and the worker to find a job. It is an ancient, but still terrible irony that while many leaders of men create division in pursuit of grand ambitions, the children of man are united in the simple, elusive desire for a life of fruitful and rewarding toil. As I said in Baltimore, I hope one day we can help all the people of Asia toward that desire: not at the price of peace—for we are ready to bear a more painful cost—but as part of our obligations of justice toward our fellow man.

Let me also add a personal note. I do not find it easy to send young men into battle. I have spoken to you today of divisions, and forces and units. But I know them all, every one. I have seen them in every State of our Union working and laughing, building and filled with life. And I know, too, how their mothers weep and their families sorrow. It is the most agonizing and painful duty of my office.

And there is something else.

When I was young, poverty was so common we didn't know it had a name. An education was something you had to fight for. And water was life itself.

I have now been in public life for more than three decades. In each of those 35 years I have seen good men and wise men work to bring the blessings of our land to all our people.

And now I am the President of the United States.

It is now my opportunity to help give every child an education—every Negro and every other citizen an equal opportunity—every family a decent home—and to help bring healing to the sick and dignity to the old.

As I have said before, it is what I have wanted all my life. And I do not want to see all those hopes—the dreams of so many people for so many years—drowned in the wasteful ravages of war.

I will do all I can so that never happens.

But I also know, as long as there are men who hate and destroy we must have the courage to resist or see it all—all we have built and all we hope to build—dreams, freedom, all—all swept away on the flood of conquest.

So this too shall not happen, we will stand in Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks in regard to the President and the Vietnam situation.

The President is weighted down with a very heavy burden as a result of Communist aggression in southeast Asia. He is doing everything in his power to follow the safest course, the best course, for the people of the United States and for the people of the world. I think it is wise that he has assumed a policy of firmness rather than a policy of vacillation and appeasement. I think it is good that he has not been belligerent or overbearing in dealing with other nations of the world on this matter. I think it speaks well of the President that he has shared his concern, his grief, and his worry about this problem with the Members of the Congress and with others in seeking the best road to follow toward the goal of lasting peace.

Any policy we follow in Vietnam will

be dangerous and fraught with many hazards. However, I want to join the gentleman from Oklahoma in commending the President for his well-reasoned, clear, and unequivocal statement of today which was designed, not to promote discord or increase the atmosphere of tension in the world, but rather to show the whole world that we are seeking a just and honorable peace. All objective people everywhere cannot but conclude that the President, in his actions today and heretofore in dealing with this problem, has sought to find peace not only for the welfare of the people of South Vietnam but also for the welfare of the people of the United States and for free people everywhere.

I think the American people will be heartened by his steadfast purpose though somewhat sobered by the awesome responsibilities which confront us at this time. When we Americans put our hand to the plow, we do not turn back. In my judgment, the Members of the Congress and the people of the Nation support the President in the actions announced today. The American people will not be turned aside but will find the road to enduring peace out of all the conflict and unrest of the moment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the American people and the people of the world applaud the firm, forthright, fair and courageous manner in which the President addressed our Nation today. He has been temperate in this problem. He has been completely honest with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the only way to win a war is to take and hold the enemy's territory. That is the job that lies ahead. We are in a war. It is a bloody and it is a costly war. It is going to get bigger.

The American people realize the problem and know that we have to get on with it. Whatever the mistakes have been in the past, we now have before us only the choice of being pushed out or taking whatever steps are necessary to win in southeast Asia. If we fail to win this conflict there will not be a nation left west of Hawaii in 10 years which is friendly to the United States. Everything out there will be Communist.

None of us likes this situation. We are confronted with a terrible dilemma, but we have to go ahead. The longer we delay the more costly it will be. I know that the American people realize, as the President has assured us time and again, that it is not decisiveness but indecisiveness which encourages Communist aggression.

Korea, Berlin, Cuba, should have taught us that there is no substitute for determination to win. If I know the American people they will want to get on with whatever it is we have to do to win this conflict. I think that is the attitude of every thinking person as a result of the President's message today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

July 28, 1965

17967

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today's message by President Johnson was a frank and factual statement to the people of our Nation and to the world. In simple and plain language he warned the Communist leaders that the free world will stand firm and not retreat in the path of Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

The people of the free nations and some day the enslaved people now under the heel of Communist tyranny will offer thanks to the United States for our sacrifice in saving humanity from total Communist world enslavement.

President Eisenhower in 1951, before he was elected President testified as a general and leader of the European program to aid and restore the war stricken nations. He appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and stated that all Europe would be Communist today—1951—if it had not been for the aid and sacrifice made by the United States to restore helpless nations and protect them from Communist aggression.

Korea, 15 years ago, was a great victory for the free world when the Communists were defeated in their mad program to enslave the Pacific islands nations and Asia.

Vietnam is another brazen step in their program to enslave one small nation after another. If they succeed in Vietnam other nations will no doubt fold to their threats and they will be set for further aggressions.

No doubt South American nations would be their next victims.

If the United States, as the leader of the free world, retreats, it will be but a matter of time until the United States will be an island in an ocean of world communism.

If that program of Communist dictators succeeds, our economy would collapse, unemployment, discontent would be rampant and our freedom would collapse. Congratulations to President Johnson and his great speech to the world today. He needs the support of all patriotic citizens in the United States and throughout the globe.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his fine and accurate statement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank our able majority leader who, as he so often does, has spoken eloquently what is in the hearts of many Americans today in his comments upon the President's message of noon today.

Mr. Speaker, once again President Johnson has stated in clear and inspiring

terms the objectives of our Nation in Vietnam, and our determination to hold the line for freedom in that distant land.

The President's firm restatement today of our Government's willingness to negotiate for an honorable peace "with any government" should silence unreasoning critics who charge us with pursuing too hard a line in Vietnam.

At the same time, the actions announced by the President to strengthen our forces overseas are solid evidence of our determination to honor our commitments to South Vietnam, and to do whatever is necessary to defeat the forces of aggression there.

I support the President's firm and balanced policy and believe it is deserving of the united support of all Americans.

Certainly history has convincingly demonstrated, as the President eloquently said, that retreat is seldom the road to either peace or freedom.

Our best road to peace and freedom in Asia is being followed resolutely by the President, and his fellow Americans can best advance the cause of peace and freedom by giving our forces in Vietnam, and their Commander in Chief in Washington, their resolute united support.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my friend for his very excellent statement.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our eminent majority leader and others who have spoken more eloquently than I can in support of the outstanding statement which the President of the United States made at his news conference earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, the President has made an historic pronouncement and has taken actions in Vietnam which will further mark him as one of the truly great Chief Executives in America history.

President Johnson has indicated again that America is determined to stand firm in Vietnam. He has defined the issue clearly and he has left no doubt that the primary purpose of our policy is peace with justice.

With the overwhelming power of the United States it would be possible to take the easy-looking road, to try to eliminate our frustrations and ruthlessly throw all of America's military might into this conflict. Such a course might attain what would seem to be an easy solution. But the President has again stressed the grave dangers implicit in this situation. He realizes full well the holocaust which would result from world war III. He has reiterated that we will leave no stone unturned to bring this cruel conflict to the conference table. Only then will the people of the world be able to get on with the good old fight against poverty, against ignorance, against intolerance and disease at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has shown that he knows the proper measure of power and restraint to use in

approaching this delicate issue. He has also demonstrated that he can use the right combinations of firmness and flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that millions of Americans and peoples all over the world will support the President in this action.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia has made a very excellent contribution to this discussion and I appreciate what the gentleman has said.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join in the expressions of my colleagues and in particular with those of the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the President is a man of peace. But as he and we know so well, peace cannot be achieved by inaction or mere disengagement. A peace of vacillation, of weakness, of retreat before force is always a temporary respite nothing more. The only hope for peace in Asia and for the freedom of independent peoples and states lies with our ability and will to resist force and terror as instruments of aggression.

Thousands of American fighting men are in Vietnam today. Thousands more will be in Vietnam in the coming months. We know that many American lives may be lost, but our commitment has been given and it will be met. The President has again made that clear to friend and to foe alike.

At the same time the President has reiterated our desire to seek every avenue of negotiation, to come to any conference table, and to cooperate with any nation in resolving the bitter conflict in Vietnam. He has reemphasized again the importance that the United States attaches to the efforts of the United Nations in seeking a peaceful solution. Finally he has underscored our determination not only to bring stability and freedom to South Vietnam, but to supply massive aid and technical assistance as soon as conditions permit to raise the conditions of life for all the people of that beleaguered country.

Mr. Speaker, the President and the great majority of the Congress and the country are of one mind, of one heart, and of one will in these goals of our policy and effort. The President has shown the leadership. The country will respond. The support that every American President has received from a free people in times of difficulty and danger will be given to President Johnson. No nation should doubt the strength or endurance of that support; to do so would be the most serious of miscalculations.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include as part of

July 28, 1965

my remarks the statement made by the President of the United States today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point: Messrs. BOGGS, MORGAN, RIVERS of South Carolina, ZABLOCKI, HEBERT, MULTER, DENT, and MORRIS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BOGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand behind the President. There is only one course for us to follow in Vietnam, that is to protect the people of South Vietnam against Communist aggression.

Any alternative under present circumstances would involve surrender. Any backing down in Vietnam would shake the confidence of the entire world in the United States and what the United States stands for.

We have to face the fact that the United States is the keystone in the defense of the free world against Communist aggression. If we weaken, the defense structure which we and they depend on will collapse.

We are in for a hard fight and we will gain no glory from it. I do not regard the situation as hopeless. I am confident that we have the determination and the ability to do the job.

I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the American people understand the issues and endorse the position the President has taken.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and its chosen representatives will rally behind the President in this period of crisis in South Vietnam.

Stephen Decatur—one of America's greatest heroes of another day—said that in her dealings with other nations:

My country, may she always be in the right, but right or wrong, my country.

Mr. Speaker, our country is right, and this is not the time to debate the wisdom of the President's most recent decision. This is the time for every American to give him his sympathy, understanding and support.

Mr. Speaker, every American wants victory in Vietnam. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that the President wants victory in Vietnam. But, Mr. Speaker, all of us join the President in wishing for victory at the lowest possible cost in human life. We must back him in every endeavor to bring victory and the termination of hostilities in the most honorable manner. It is imperative that we back him in this endeavor. I, for one, will give him every ounce of my energy both personally and as the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of this body and this undertaking so vital to this Nation and her brave fighting men everywhere on earth.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Johnson's clear and forceful restatement of our national purposes in South Vietnam. Those genuinely interested in justice for our fellow men must endorse the President's determination to stand fast and fulfill our commitment in protecting the freedom and dignity of the people of Vietnam. There should be no doubt that if we fail to keep our word in Vietnam and permit that nation to fall to communism we will invite other and even more difficult problems in other areas of the entire world.

President Johnson has again revealed to the Communist aggressors both the arrows and the olive branches in the eagle's claws. The choice is theirs to make. It is absolutely essential that we stand firm in the face of counting aggression. At the same time we must make every effort to find a way to bring peace to a war-ravaged nation.

I firmly believe that each one of us must continue to accept the President's call to support him in these efforts.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be one of those invited to the White House this morning to hear the course of action which he planned in Vietnam and which he broadcast to the American people and to the world a few hours later.

I have a very good reason in rising today in support of the President of the United States.

There are those who do not agree with the President on many of his domestic policies, and it is no secret that included among them is myself. Because of this difference of opinion I believe what I am about to say becomes all the more significant.

There is no limitation or qualification to my support of President Johnson in this hour of crisis. He is the President of the American people and as an American I support him. If he is to have the respect of the world, he must have our respect, plus our support.

It is a horrible thing to send men to die, and since beginning of time men have died in order that more men might live.

Liberty has been bought with blood and has been preserved in blood.

I wish it were otherwise, but the cold facts of life are that this is the price which we must pay. I have walked among the crosses of Flanders, Anzio, and the islands of the Pacific. They are all reminders that beneath them rest men who have died in order that those of us who now live could walk as freemen.

The President has discharged his responsibility and has made what he considers the right decision in a moderate approach at the moment to the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

There were other avenues open. Some of these avenues are more flamboyantly lighted and others decorated in dazzling colors of defiance. The avenue he chose to walk is one paved with solid stones of determination and flanked with signs of direction to peace for the world.

I approve his approach.

He has not forsaken or eliminated other avenues of approach if this one

does not lead to the destination desired. He has done what he thinks is best for his country and the people of the world who seek peace.

If future conditions demand that the present approach be abandoned or changed, he can do it with honor.

In choosing the path which he has, the President has given his fellow Americans the time to pause and reflect on the seriousness of the situation and the dangers which lie ahead if we forsake our commitments.

He has given the world the opportunity to understand our dedication to the cause of peace and freedom.

He has given time for our enemies to come to the realization that America means business and will not be deterred in its objective of peace for all peoples of the world.

Of course there will be those who will continue to disagree. There will be those who will be critical. My hope is that those of us in responsible positions and privy to information which guards the security of our country shall be most cautious in uttering or doing anything which might give comfort to the enemy.

At this time in our lives we should stand solidly behind the President and back him to the hilt. We should declare to the world that our President speaks for all Americans in the Nation's dealing with any nation.

We should stand united and determined behind the President at this crossroads to the peace of the world, fully knowing and fully realizing that he acts only in the best interest of the people who have placed their trust in him.

I cannot add to what has been said here today.

I can only repeat what I have said on this floor and on many occasions, and that is what I so deeply believe.

As we repeat our prayers day after day, the same words, the same plea, the same admonition, so can we repeat day after day, repeat and repeat the words of Admiral Decatur which never grow old but gain in significance with the passing of each generation.

Yes, again I repeat the toast of Stephen Decatur:

Gentlemen, our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right. But right or wrong—our country.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege indeed to follow the leadership of our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Once again he has spoken out in no uncertain terms.

The peace-loving people of our country and of the world know that our President wants nothing more than peace for us and for all mankind.

At the same time, aggressors who would destroy our liberties and enslave us are again put on notice that we practice what we preach.

We will use none of our power for aggrandizement but will use every last bit of it, if necessary, to prevent aggrandizement, oppression, and suppression, wherever the ugly head of terroristic might is raised.

It is good to know that we have a Commander in Chief who does not panic, who moves deliberately but surely, using only as much force as is needed, with due regard to all the important factors involved.

We are in good hands.

Well done and well said, Mr. President.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in joining our distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, in his very profound statement, reflecting the wisdom of our President's position as given to the American people in his noonday talk on the problems on Vietnam.

History will record the fact that in all of the trying situations that have arisen during the President's regime he has leaned over backwards in his attempts to bring this conflict to an honorable conclusion.

History must also record the titanic struggle between free men and the victims of Communist enslavement that are the real issues in the jungles and villages of this disturbed Nation.

His reassurance to the American people of his determination to use all our resources with the utmost discretion and only after all avenues have been explored and all hope has been lost that reasonable persons can get together on a solution.

The use of our troops when absolutely required is promised but any hope of the Communists propagandists that our President would be stamped into any decision in the area of action has been completely dissipated by the cool, calm, and logical report to all the American people.

Never in our history have the American people been given a complete and candid report in a matter of this seriousness.

Those of us in Congress who know the President's resourcefulness and personal integrity have always been confident that he would measure up to the judgment of the American people, a judgment passed upon his qualifications in a free and open election.

Our President, never fear, is still in command and with this we know our future is in the hands of a man dedicated to freedom and to the integrity of our commitments.

His determination to both protect our people and our Nation as well as keeping our commitments is the strength that dismays our enemies even more so than our military hardware.

The people of Vietnam, all the people both in the North and the South, will eventually see that the true believer and true defender of their personal and national rights, privileges, and integrity, is the President and the people of the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to avail myself of this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. THOMAS E. MORGAN, the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I know it was a painful duty for the

President of the United States to commit additional American manpower and materials to southeast Asia but the only alternative was to run the risk of permitting the forces of aggression to continue unchecked to enslave the freedom loving people of South Vietnam. After South Vietnam, what would be the next target? No one really knows—but history has taught us that the fuel that feeds the fire of Communist aggression is never extinguished.

I commend the President for the unflinching courage and fortitude he displayed in making this most difficult decision.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues, and with my countrymen throughout this land, in applauding President Johnson's articulate and eloquent statement on the subject of Vietnam.

There are many times when the responsibilities of our position place upon us the burden of making some very hard decisions. Surely the burden upon our President is much, much greater, for in his hands rests direct responsibility for the future of our Nation, of peace and freedom in the world. With this at stake, I know that the decisions the President had to make about our course in Vietnam involved much soul-searching and much personal anguish.

Yet the decisions which the President made—and which he eloquently reiterated today—are probably the only acceptable alternatives available to us. For as the President pointed out, victory has never satisfied the appetite of an aggressor, appeasement has never brought peace to the world. And so, if we truly seek peace, and if we are concerned about the security of our Nation not only for our but also for future generations, we must be determined to stand fast when confronted with aggression. This is what we are doing in Vietnam.

At the same time, I also applaud that part of the President's speech in which he again restated his willingness to sit down at a conference table, and to pursue a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Vietnam. We must never be afraid to negotiate if negotiation is possible. It remains to be seen, however, whether the North Vietnamese will be equally willing to talk and to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, the course which we are pursuing in Vietnam is the right course, even though it is an extremely difficult and perilous course. Let us stand together in this hour of our national test, and support our President.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record today, and may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the President's statement today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE OTEPKA CASE

(Mr. MINSHALL (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we have another cover-up going on in the Johnson administration. This one is as contemptuous of the people's right to know as was the scandalous Bobby Baker cover-up and it is much more serious because it goes to the heart of the Nation's security.

For months the members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have been trying to find out why the State Department fired its top security evaluator, Otto Otepka. They have not been able to, and another volume of hearings on the subject released for publication today shows that the lid still is on.

Otepka is a man of character and accomplishment who has served his Government for 20 years. But when he testified truthfully before the Senate subcommittee which was investigating alleged laxities in the State Department's security system, he was ordered fired.

The record in this case reeks with evasion and outright falsehood. Three employees of the State Department, two of them high officials, gave untruthful testimony when they got caught. But in at least one case, even the revision was not truthful.

The testimony released today shows that the State Department witnesses still cannot force themselves to be frank and cooperative with the Senate investigators. They say "no" or "maybe" when the answer should be "yes." They evade and cover up. The truth still is hidden.

We still must ask why Otepka was fired. Was it because he told the truth to the Senate investigators and thereby embarrassed his superiors? Was it because he objected to free and easy security clearance for critical department employees, such as the 150 waivers of preliminary investigation by Secretary Rusk? Was it because Otepka insisted that security clearance be withheld from doubtful appointees?

The American people have a right to the answers to those questions and Secretary Rusk has a duty to provide them.

Last fall all State Department security field records were ordered burned. These were unduplicated records used for leads and contacts by field investigators. Then, more than 30 seasoned field investigators were reassigned to other cities so that even their knowledge of the files was rendered useless.

July 28, 1965

This, coming on top of the Otepka case, makes one wonder if the State Department really is concerned about security risks on its payroll.

The key to the answer lies in an open hearing for Otto Otepka.

Fe Curtis
PINCH-PENNY WAR POLICY LAID TO
UNITED STATES

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, responsible, courageous, imaginative reporting is one of the rarest commodities in the discussion that should be taking place about what is really happening in Vietnam. All America is therefore very fortunate, especially the Members of Congress, the press, and interested readers of the RECORD, that Charles J. V. Murphy, the Washington editor of *Fortune* magazine, has again produced a major analytical article about a troubled spot in this world.

On September 20, 1961—A-7456-A-7460—I brought to the attention of this House Mr. Murphy's reporting first of certain situations involving the Cuban invasion. Although this was denied and denounced by some, on January 30, 1963—A-394-5—I was delighted to be able to report that the Overseas Press Club had given its award for the best foreign reporting to Charles J. V. Murphy for his article on the ill-fated Cuban invasion. Now, in the August issue of *Fortune* magazine, there is a major piece about Vietnam and about what Mr. Murphy has found there. The Washington Star, July 26, 1965, carried an Associated Press story about this, which follows:

PINCH-PENNY WAR POLICY LAID TO
UNITED STATES

New York.—Charles J. V. Murphy, an editor of *Fortune* magazine and onetime aide to an Air Force chief of staff, says after a visit to Vietnam that he was "distressed and shocked" by American conduct of the war there.

Writing in the August issue of the magazine, he called the Bien Hoa Air Base "the dirtiest, most solvently, ramshackle air operation I have every witnessed."

Murphy said he saw the explosion that destroyed 22 planes and damaged others at the base in May.

Murphy, who was a special assistant to the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, Air Force chief of staff, said that when he visited the base the day before the explosions, he found it crowded with about 800 planes "wingtip to wingtip for want of dispersal room."

He said he found that because of a lack of funds, about a dozen concrete and earth embankments to protect the planes had not been completed.

Murphy said:

"The penny-pinching attitude that contributed to this episode and the timidity that impelled experienced officers to endure a scandalous situation did credit to no one."

He also wrote:

"It makes no sense to send American foot soldiers, rifles and grenades at the ready, into the rain forests and the rice paddies . . . to grapple with a foe whom they cannot distinguish by face or tongue from the same racial stock they seek to defend.

"On every count—disease, tropical heat and rain, the language curtain—the odds are much too high."

Murphy said the United States, instead, should emphasize an air offensive against North Vietnam, accompanied by a blockade of the North Vietnamese coast.

It is important that we read the whole Murphy article in context and this I hope the Members of the House will do, regardless of whether they agree or disagree with his conclusions.

What must be borne in mind is that Mr. Murphy is a very mature human being who has for many years covered the Washington scene and military affairs around the world. He is no youngster making first-guess impressions about Vietnam, which has been the case about some of the writing concerning this very complicated situation. He has been for months in southeast Asia and has been imaginative enough to visit some of the countries which are supplying limited troops and assistance to the South Vietnamese and the Americans. I refer particularly to his visits to countries such as New Zealand and Australia.

Although this article may well be again denounced and denied, I want to remind the Members of this House what happened to other articles, such as the one about the Cuban invasion, and how finally the facts as reported by Mr. Murphy and carefully reviewed by the editors of *Fortune* have turned out to be both true and of assistance to the Congress.

Last year Mr. Murphy wrote two articles about Vietnam which merit rereading. In May he reported that the war was going to last a long time unless certain actions were taken. In September he stated that President Johnson should act at that time instead of waiting until after the election.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article of Mr. Murphy which appeared in the August 1965 edition of *Fortune* magazine at this point:

TRAVELER TO THE PACIFIC WARS

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

(NOTE.—*Fortune* editor Charles Murphy has been making an extended tour of the South Pacific. His report on New Zealand, "Traveler in a Small Utopia," and Australia, "Traveler on the Rim of Asia," appeared in the May and June issues. From Australia he flew on to Singapore and Bangkok. A report on that area will be detailed in an early issue. This letter begins with his reflections as he approaches Saigon and the larger war in Vietnam.)

There was not much to see from 30,000 feet. In these near equatorial latitudes, the rainy season had begun rather earlier than usual, and much of the time the plane was either in or over soggy, heavy cloud layers. Soon after takeoff from Bangkok, however, I noticed that the pilot angled southward over the Gulf of Siam, so as to skirt the Cambodian delta. Some few days before, the left-leaning, somewhat frivolous Prince Sihanouk had noisily broken off such diplomatic business as until then went on between Cambodia and the United States. His displeasure embraced Thailand as well, as America's good and helpful ally, and it was therefore only commonsense for the Thai commercial pilots to shy clear of the itchy-fingered gunners, friends and foes alike, who man the Cambodian-Vietnamese borders.

At this stage of my travels I was well up what I had come to think of as the Pacific

ladder of trouble, which stretches from the Antipodes through Malaysia and Thailand into Taiwan and beyond to Panmunjom, across some 10,000 miles of land and ocean in all. In Borneo I had been shown what might in modesty be described as a VIP view of that other major Asian war—the so-called confrontation war between the new British-protected state of Malaysia and Indonesia. It's a bona fide war all right, although for cost and killing it doesn't begin to compare with the one that we Americans are in for in Vietnam, some 400 miles away, on the far shore of the South China Sea. Still, there were small but sharp running sea fights at night in Singapore Harbor while I was there, and shooting was going on in the rubber plantations of Johore and in the pepper groves of Sarawak and Sabah.

From Singapore, in due course, I had gone on to Bangkok. Alone among the SEATO partners and the American allies in the Pacific, Thailand occupies a physical bridge, or link, between the British war to save for the West the sea gate between the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the American war to save for the West a political and military lodgement on the Asian Continent. Though Bangkok itself is the capital of the SEATO alliance, Thailand is not yet formally a belligerent in the Far East. Nevertheless, it has become a studied way a defacto power in both situations. It has bravely lent its geography to the Laotians and ourselves in manners it does not wish specified for military pressures against the North Vietnamese deployments that are a potential hazard to Thailand. It has also begun to give serious attention, for the first time, to the feasibility of a joint operation with the British and Malaysian forces for the purpose of cornering in the wild mountains of southern Thailand a band of Peiping-oriented guerrillas who are the last surviving cadres of the Communist movement that sought to take over postwar Malaya.

Nations and people of like minds in the western and southern Pacific, it seemed to me, were finally beginning to come together out of a realization of a growing common danger. A year ago the United States, Britain, New Zealand, Australia, and Malaysia were pursuing their separate interests in the Pacific with sidelong glances at each other to see how the other was faring. Then, in a matter of months, the Australians and New Zealanders became engaged. Australians are now fighting in Malaysia; both Australia and New Zealand have taken the hard decision to send combat troops into South Vietnam. And so the alliances are converging.

There was no mystery about the circumstances that had finally begun to pull the Pacific alliances together. It was, first, the suddenly appalling realization that the fragile structure of South Vietnam was on the verge of falling apart and, next, the spectacle of the United States striking with its too long withheld airpower at North Vietnam and moving tens of thousands of combat troops across the Pacific into South Vietnam. But it was not simply the agony of Vietnam, heartrending as that is, that finally galvanized the non-Communist powers into action. What happened was that tardily but unblinkingly the politicians in power in these Pacific nations finally recognized and faced up to a still distant but ultimate danger.

THE TIME TO STOP MAO

Most certainly the danger does not rest simply with a fear that if South Vietnam should go down, then that wily septuagenarian Ho Chi-Minh will fasten communism on a primitive community that does not really want communism. The central danger is that if the Vietnamese social structure should finally dissolve, in the face of the

now quite desperate American efforts to hold it together, then the Red Chinese will have stunningly proved the case for the so-called wars of national liberation, was waged in the guise (to borrow the jargon of the original Soviet handbook) of "anti-imperialist national-liberation movements."

It may come as a surprise to some, but the fact is that few understand this rising danger more acutely than do the politicians and intellectuals of the non-Communist Socialist left. In Auckland and Wellington, in Canberra and Melbourne and Sydney, in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur, one man after another said as much to me. Their shared reasoning went something like this: "You Americans must never give up in Vietnam. Red China is the enemy. Now is the time to stop Mao. Only you Americans have the military power to do the job." Then, after a pause, this sotto voce apology: "Of course you will appreciate why we can't say this publicly. Politics, you know." All the politicians in the Pacific knew that even Prime Minister Shastri of India, while publicly deploring the American air bombing of North Vietnam, had privately spoken admiringly of the American resolution. And the diplomatic grapevine vibrated with the news that even Prince Sihanouk and the somewhat anti-American Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yu of Singapore were agreed in their private conversations in May at Phnompenh that American military power had entered the battle none too soon.

What the Pacific leaders are finally braced for while still flinching from openly acknowledging its inevitability, is a decisive contest between the United States and Red China. There can be no real peace in their world of non-Communist Asians—a community of 1 billion people—until the power question has been settled one way or another. I pondered what this judgment involves for us: can the United States even hold on in Vietnam without pressing the war home directly against North Vietnam and the power center in Hanoi itself? Judgment on this was to be made soon enough on my arrival in Saigon. What I was sure of, already, was that a whole new experience, a test, a struggle, possibly even some fantastic ordeal, is unmistakably in the making for the United States in the Pacific, and a new and formidable chapter has opened in U.S. history. There is no mistaking the character and meaning of one fundamental happening. It is that the U.S. strategic center of gravity has moved west of the 180th meridian, into the Asian Pacific. It is almost certain to stay there for years to come.

The pity, the folly, is that the famous men who have been manipulating the American tactics and strategy in the struggle for South Vietnam let the rot and collapse there go on so long. Indeed, I was hardly back in Saigon before I began to wonder whether all of Lyndon Johnson's men have grasped the full seriousness of the new situation. After getting settled in the Caravelle Hotel in the center of the city, and sharing a meal with several colleagues in a tiny bistro run by an expatriate Frenchman with a perhaps exaggerated reputation for occasional murder, I took a walk in the direction of the Saigon River. My path led me past the American Embassy, which had been all but demolished in March by terrorists' bombs. With the reconstruction not yet finished, it put me in mind of the bridge structure of a battleship. The outer walls had been heavily reinforced; the once tall windows had been contracted to narrow turret-like slits; shatterproof plastic was being substituted for glass, to reduce the danger from lethal flying splinters in the event of another bombing; and the street approaches to the building itself had been closed off with upended sections of

sewerpipe weighted with concrete to form a barricade.

These defensive dispositions I noted with approval. Then I was taken aback to hear my companion, an officer of fairly senior rank, say that on orders from Washington construction of a new Embassy, to cost about \$1 million, was to be started immediately in a residential area. The design had been chosen some years ago, during the falaise lull that followed the French defeat and withdrawal; it calls for a handsome three-story office building with spacious windows and wide entrances appropriate for a tranquil garden setting. The site was further attractive at the time of its acquisition because of its close proximity to the Premier's office. In the current mood of Saigon, however, this handiness no longer is an advantage. There have been 10 changes of government since November 1963—or were there only 9?—and the mobs have got into the habit of demonstrating in front of their Premier's windows every few months, usually in protest over his supposed subservience to the American Ambassador. To put up the new Embassy more or less on the direct line of the mobs' accustomed march struck me as a heedless action. Indeed, the whole scheme seemed most untimely; our diplomacy, my friend and I were agreed, might be most prudently conducted for the time being in the present bunker and the million dollars invested in ammunition.

OUR LONGEST LOSING WAR

If I appear cynical about the conduct of American business in South Vietnam, it is because in the course of my visit here I find it hard to be anything but distressed and shocked by the American management of what has become a large and costly war. With the end nowhere in sight, it is already the longest losing war that Americans have been engaged in since the French-Indian wars of the middle 18th century.

In President Eisenhower's last year, U.S. military aid to Vietnam came to only \$65 million and our military mission there totaled 773 officers and men. Within a year our military aid to that country was more than doubled, rising as it did in fiscal 1962 to about \$144 million, and the military mission was increased some twentyfold, the strength rising to nearly 17,000 men. As this article went to press, early in July, something like 75,000 U.S. troops were already deployed, in one role or another, in South Vietnam. This figure does not take into account some 27,000 flyers and sailors who man Carrier Task Force 77 of the 7th Fleet, and who are wholly in the fight. Nor does it include the general support being provided the forward forces by the large permanent Air Force and Navy establishments in the Philippines, Japan, and on Okinawa. Very substantial fractions of the Tactical Air Command and the Navy's fast carrier task forces have been concentrated in the Pacific, and the westward, or Pacific, tilt of our military resources is generally much more pronounced than most Americans realize.

The capital input has also soared, although its true magnitude has been to some degree concealed. As the battle went against "McNamara's war" (as he himself described it), he was able to absorb the rising costs without a stiff boost in the defense budget by drawing upon the emergency-reserve stocks of the U.S. forces and by reducing or deferring their less urgent normal operations. As a former controller, the Secretary appreciates, of course, the eventual perils of such a practice for a defense strategy that stressed a high degree of readiness for both general war and simultaneous limited wars oceans apart. The running costs of the Vietnamese operation appear to have risen to about \$2.2 billion annually. These costs break down roughly as follows:

Continuing economic aid to keep the Saigon government afloat and to pay the bureaucracy: about \$300 million annually.

Other economic support for the Vietnamese infrastructure: about \$70 million.

Military-assistance program (weapons, pay for the Vietnamese forces, overhead cost of the U.S. military advisory establishment): about \$330 million annually.

Indirect costs represented by other forms of U.S. participation—including the combat forces, day-to-day military operating costs—that are absorbed by the U.S. defense budget: an estimated \$800 million annually.

Extraordinary additional U.S. military costs, chiefly for port and airfield construction, and for replacing reserve stocks of ammunition, fuel, and so forth: \$700 million, to be financed by the supplementary appropriation that President Johnson asked for in May.

And we are in for an eventual bill for the war that will be much stiffer than the Pentagon cares to divulge just now.

THE MONSOON OFFENSIVE

Although McNamara has demonstrated his ability as an administrator of a vast bureaucracy, the primary job of the Pentagon is to conduct war—and the only war McNamara has so far been called upon to conduct has gone very badly from the outset. When President Johnson finally decided in February to put North Vietnam below the 20th parallel under the U.S. air counterattack, and to bring U.S. jets to bear for the first time in the battle for villages and roads inside South Vietnam, it was an act of desperation. The South Vietnamese Army was actually disintegrating. To the extent that a government remained in Saigon, it was the thinnest kind of film over the American presence.

The U.S. air counterattack achieved all that was expected of it, up to a point; it did check the Communist offensive. It had the effect of driving home barely in time a bolt to hold a door that was swinging wildly on its hinges. But by reason of the very limitations that the political direction of the war in Washington imposed upon the air counterattack, the blows have only impaired, without paralyzing, the Vietcong's capacity for further heavy fighting. There is excellent reason to believe that the North Vietnamese buildup was well advanced before the February air attacks on the principal supply lines to the Vietcong forces in the battle zone. Enough trained troops were by then already deployed inside South Vietnam, and enough battle stocks had been laid by or were within its reach, for the enemy to decide that it could still continue to sustain a powerful offensive by its standards through the monsoon season—i.e., into our autumn. Certainly, it is acting as if it had such means.

The Communist guerrilla forces are the lightest kind of infantry. Once armed and equipped, they don't need much replenishment other than ammunition. They live off the country. U.S. Army intelligence measures the Communist military strength at present inside South Vietnam, in terms of organized forces, at more than 100 battalions. It further hypothesizes that this force, with a daily average aggregate consumption of from 100 to 150 tons of supplies, could fight from 20 to 30 sharp 2-battalion-size actions every month. Ho's fitting battalions don't need much in their supply wagons, because they are not required to hold ground. The Marines and the U.S. Army in their redoubts and strongpoints are not the targets. The target is the exposed hamlet or district or provincial capital, or the column vulnerable to ambush.

So, the U.S. air counterattack notwithstanding, the critical phase of the 1965 monsoon offensive remains to be fought. No knowledgeable officer that I talked to in South Vietnam was sanguine about the out-

17972

come of the summer's fighting. It is not a question of our Marines, or our airborne troops' getting overpowered. Ho Chi Minh is much too smart to send his light infantry forward to be mowed down by American firepower. The U.S. military problem at this late hour consists in finding some way to lift the pressure from the exhausted Vietnamese village and district garrisons. And if the struggle continues to go as badly against the South Vietnamese in the rest of the monsoon season as was the case in May and June, the force of 200,000 to 300,000 American troops now being contemplated will be none too many for the task of shoring up the Vietnamese Army, holding Saigon and the major ports and airfields and strategic provincial capitals—let alone for the task of winning the campaign.

AN OLD SOLDIER'S ADVICE

This is an outcome that was never meant to be. U.S. ground forces fighting Asians in Asia? Until the other day, the idea was all but unthinkable. At the White House, for example, whenever the question arose of how U.S. military power might best be used in Asia, President Johnson used to tell about his last talk with Gen. Douglas MacArthur at Walter Reed Hospital. "Son," the President quotes the dying soldier as saying to him, "don't ever get yourself bogged down in a land war in Asia."

MacArthur's view has been an article of faith with U.S. military men and notably of the Army Chiefs of Staff ever since the bloody island campaigns against the Japanese. It was a view shared by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor before he was sent to Saigon as special U.S. Ambassador. Once there, and with Vietnam falling apart around him, Taylor reversed his position. He was not happy about it. He was confronted with the testing of a military policy by which he himself, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and McNamara had reshaped the Armed Forces over a period of 3½ years, making a great point of preparing U.S. troops for limited and counterinsurgency wars. The truth is the Army's investment in these particular skills was nothing like what it was cracked up to be. Nevertheless, in the absence of decision in Washington to aim the U.S. air attack primarily at North Vietnam, Taylor had no choice but to ask the President for combat troops to be directly committed in the South.

THE MORNING THE B-57 BLEW UP

As I looked around, I could not help feeling that the condition of our forces left much to be desired in the most elementary respects. One of the major military air bases in Vietnam is at a place called Bien Hoa, 18 miles northeast of Saigon. At the time of my visit there, in May, jet operations were possible only from three runways in the entire country, and Bien Hoa had one of them. The original airstrip was built by the French Air Force, on a rubber plantation that occupied the north bank of the Dongnai River. One can drive to Bien Hoa from downtown Saigon in half an hour over a new three-lane asphalt highway. Light-engineering plants have sprung up on both sides of the roads, and racing along with the crowded buses and the careening trucks and the honking and hooting motorbikes, one has the sense of passing through a thriving, prospering, mushrooming suburb. This impression is valid enough, as regards the construction indexes. But the area is also a genuine no man's land. Open to traffic and commerce with Saigon by day, it reverts to Vietcong control at night. The notorious war zone D—a densely forested stronghold that the B-52's have been methodically bombing—begins just to the north of the airfield and every few days or so, black-suited Vietcong in their outposts take potshots at planes on the final approach.

When I came this way a year ago, the Air Force contingent at Bien Hoa numbered only

400 men and they operated 40 light planes. When I returned this year, one blindingly hot Saturday morning, it was to find the Air Force unit swollen to about 2,300 men and they were operating 100 planes, including a number of light jet B-57 bombers. And that was not all. On the same field were jammed another 100 U.S. Army planes, mostly helicopters, plus another 100 planes belonging to the Vietnamese Air Force, mostly light, close-support, propeller-driven craft. This made a total of about 300 aircraft collected around a single strip. It was the dirtiest, most sofly, ramshackle air operation I have ever visited. One can excuse a lot in war, but the confusion, disorder, and disarray here were beyond excuse.

For one thing, more than 6 months earlier, in the early morning hours of November 1, 1964, a handful of Vietcong mortar men who had penetrated the base's outer defense system laid down a fast and accurate barrage that destroyed, in a matter of minutes, five costly B-57 bombers on their hardstands. The chances of a return visit by the Vietcong were high and, indeed, shortly before my call, a brigade of the U.S. 173d Airborne Division was hastily taking up positions around the base to guard it from an expected attack in force. Yet even then, the costly planes, tens of millions of dollars' worth of them, stood wingtip to wingtip for want of dispersal room; and, incredibly, a dozen or so simple concrete and earth revetments to protect the planes had not been finished. Funds for new construction, I presently learned, were difficult to come by in Washington. So under the very eyes of the two-star Air Force theater commander, the four-star Army general in command of the entire war, and even the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs who sat in Saigon, the squalid, inefficient, and dangerous operation at Bien Hoa was tolerated and left to an overworked Air Force colonel to manage as best he could.

The poor chap didn't manage very well. Less than 24 hours later, from an angled distance of maybe 2,000 yards and a height of 4,000 feet, I was a chance eyewitness of Bien Hoa's second and far larger disaster. I was aboard a Navy plane, en route to Task Force 77 on station in the South China Sea. Our course took us past the base and, as it happened, while he was only 2 minutes or so away, our pilot saw a puff of smoke, then a swelling fireball, and he sent word aft that Bien Hoa seemed to be "blowing up." When the field came abeam, I saw that the entire block of B-57's was fiercely ablaze, and the conflagration had spread to long files of light piston-powered bombers, the A-1's. My first thought was that the Vietcong mortar specialists had done it again; then I realized that the recurring explosions were caused by bombs exploding in the racks of the burning planes. A careful inquiry by the Air Force failed to identify the root cause of the disaster. Most likely, a defective fuse or the faulty stowing of an old 750-pound bomb aboard one of the B-57's—the bombers there still were being armed with 1944 vintage iron bombs—started the chain reaction. Twenty-two planes blew up, more were damaged; a loss of that magnitude in an air battle would have been cause for national anxiety. The penny-pinching that contributed to this episode and the timidity that impelled experienced officers to endure a scandalous situation did credit to no one.

REFLECTIONS IN A HELICOPTER

The American officer corps is, needless to say, a good deal more competent than this incident may suggest. In Vietnam, though, the Army is up against a slippery, slithering kind of battle that it can't seem to get a hard grip on. Doubts about the Army's preparedness for such campaigning were amply confirmed—despite all the high-flown theorizing about counterinsurgency tactics. A morning's helicopter tour of a crucial war

zone in the company of an intelligent, youthful operations-planning officer, Brig. Gen. William E. DePuy, was highly informative in this respect.

A helicopter can't be beaten for enabling a general of infantry to get around and to see what is going on beyond his headquarters. On this particular morning, General DePuy, at the cost of being only 5 hours away from his busy desk in Saigon as the senior U.S. military planner, made a swing in his clattering helicopter that took him into three provinces, afforded him a grandstand view of a helicopter attack in company strength, brought him into a quick conference with the staff of a Vietnamese division engaged in a search and destroy sweep on the edges of a Vietcong staging area, and finally put him down at the heavily barricaded headquarters of a great French-operated rubber plantation for a canvass of the tactical situation with the U.S. advisers to a Vietnamese battalion that was braced, behind its sandbags and silted brick walls and barbed wire, for a night descent by the Vietcong.

Helicopter etiquette orders the seating of the noncombatant guest inside, between the escort officer and the port and starboard riflemen; their bodies are interposed between him and the open doors through which a sniper would sensibly aim. The guest must take his chances even-steven, of course, with whatever ill-aimed shot might come up through the floor. DePuy sat alongside me, and as we flew west by north, he kept up a running commentary on places and events in the changing neighborhood in view. I was familiar with the region, having traveled over the same area the year before. But I marveled again at how close the swirl of battle remains to Saigon, and how vague and impalpable the enemy remains. From our altitude one could see 40 miles or so, and in this watery domain, north and west of Saigon, given over to rice paddies, rubber and tea growing, at least 1,000 sharp battles of one kind or another—ambushes, night rushes on sleeping hamlets, skirmishes—have been fought during the past 3 years. To the west, I had a fine view through broken cloud of Cambodia and the forested waterways over which the Vietcong come and go in sampans. We flew at 5,000 feet. But I ever did see a Vietcong.

THE TROUBLESOME REDOUBT

The educational aspects of the flight included a skirting of the zone D area north of Bien Hoa. As described earlier, this is reputedly the major Vietcong base for their operations against Saigon itself. From the air, it put me in mind of the Louisiana River country, except that the forest here is much more dense, with the tree canopy reaching in places to heights of 200 feet. The forest redoubt covers about 150 square miles, and from the accounts of defectors and prisoners it is both a maze and trap made up of secret trails, hidden strongpoints and supply dumps, and bunkers connected with deep tunnels impregnable to air bombing.

None of this can be seen from the air. I was shown a short, narrow gray swath in the forest left by the Air Force in its forlorn experiment some months ago to defoliate the region by saturating the treetops with a mixture of napalm and chemicals. The chemicals were expected to dry out the trees and the napalm to set the forest ablaze. But, for various reasons, the hoped-for conflagration never got going, and the experiment was abandoned as being too costly and tricky. Now the Air Force is trying to reduce the forest to matchwood with B-52's.

I doubt even the B-52's will make much of an impression with TNT, unless McNamara wants to make tree-felling a new career for SAC, or unless SAC has the extraordinary good luck to pinpoint and smash the headquarters area. But it was equally obvious that the job of prying the enemy out of the forest tangle was hopelessly beyond the com-

July 28, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190004-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17973

petence and means of the troops we had committed. In recent major engagements the air attack has again and again finally turned the tide of battle. But it must also be said that, for the Vietnamese garrisons, the turn has usually come too late. Since the Vietcong time their assaults at night, and in the monsoon season at intervals when they can count on cover from rain and clouds, the Air Force's ability to react quickly has been sorely limited on occasion, and in consequence battalion after battalion of Vietnamese regional troops were cut to ribbons before help came. One doesn't have to look very far to observe that, except for the introduction of the helicopter, there has been little new invention to prepare the ground forces for the kind of war they are now being asked to fight. Indeed, the United States doesn't even yet have a satisfactory airplane to support this kind of action. We are therefore obliged to use planes that are either obsolete (A-1's and B-57's) or too valuable (F-105's and F-4's).

THE CASE FOR GOING NORTH

It is time that the E-ring in the Pentagon stopped kidding the troops, and that the rest of us stopped kidding ourselves. It makes no sense to send American foot soldiers, rifles and grenades at the ready, into the rain forests and the rice paddies and the dim mountain trails to grapple with a foe whom they cannot distinguish by face or tongue from the same racial stock whom they seek to defend. On every count—disease, tropical heat and rain, the language curtain—the odds are much too high against their making much of an impression. When the question arose last year of sending U.S. combat forces into South Vietnam as stiffeners, serious consideration was given to the proposition of forming them into a line, a sort of cordon sanitaire, across the jungle and mountain approaches through Laos and Cambodia, with the object of thereby sealing off the Communist supply routes. This impractical scheme was discarded in view of the all but impossible cost of supplying the Army at anything like its desired standards, and the further consideration that nine-tenths of the force's energies and means would be consumed merely in looking after itself. The solution that was adopted and is being followed now is to settle the troops in garrison-like strong-points along the coast. It has been romantically suggested that these places will in due course become sally ports from which our troops will issue forth into the hinterland, spreading in ink-spot fashion stability and hope among the hamlets. But such a process could take a decade or two short of forever. It also means military occupation, the last thing Kennedy, McNamara, Taylor & Co. had in their minds when they resolved in 1961 to risk a stand in South Vietnam. Taylor understood this perfectly, and the dreary outlook no doubt made it easier for him to leave Saigon.

THE U.S. ADVANTAGE

Is there an alternative strategy? There certainly is. It is one, however, that revolves around a different set of premises than the McNamara-Taylor strategy has so far favored. Most particularly, it means shifting the main weight of the American counterattack from a ground war below the seventeenth parallel to an air offensive in North Vietnam itself, accompanied by a blockade of the North Vietnamese coast. Does this mean leveling Hanoi? No. It means, if necessary, the deliberate, progressive destruction of the North Vietnamese infrastructure—the plants, the railroads, and electric-power systems, the ports—to a point where Ho Chi Minh can no longer support his aggression in the south. Will this cause Ho to capitulate? Not necessarily. Ho is an elderly Asian revolutionary whose education in communism began in Europe after the Bolshevik revolu-

tion. More of his adult life has been spent outside Vietnam than inside. His government will probably be wherever he chooses to hang his hat.

But if his capacity for mischief is reduced, then our object is served. That object, it seem to me, is to lift from South Vietnam, at all possible speed, the terrible pressure on its hamlets. Because that task is manifestly beyond the competence of the Army and Marine Corps, except in a prolonged and costly test of endurance, then we must pick up our weapons of technological advantage—the air arms, both sea and ground based. What has made the American fighting man better than his enemies is his higher technological proficiency. It seems folly for us to fight in Asia without drawing on this technological advantage. It may be highly desirable, for instance, to use our sea power and ground troops to a limited extent to establish a beachhead near Haiphong, thus threatening the enemy's main supply lines and forcing it to pull its troops out of southern Vietnam. Such tactics were immensely successful in Leyte Gulf and later at Inchon and had a salutary effect on equally stubborn enemies.

Would a truly stern attack on the North bring China into the war? Expert opinion splits sharply over the answer. High value would certainly have to be given to that possibility in any plan for enlarging the theatre of action. We are already in an undeclared contest of power with Red China and the question that the President has to face up to is whether in the months immediately ahead he settles for a partial defeat or failure in a war one full remove from the major enemy, or risks a clash with Red China in order to bring the secondary war under control. My own view is that Mao, should he elect to engage, will do so reluctantly and within cautious limits. He is certainly not likely to force an engagement on terms that will compel the United States to employ its technological advantage *à outrance* (to use an old-fashioned term). And I find it hard to believe he would dare to send his infantry masses over wretched roads to do battle in Southeast Asia, while Chiang Kai-shek waits and watches hopefully close by on the sea flank, with a spirited army of 400,000 men and the sharpest, most experienced, small air force in the world.

THE BIG BLUE-WATER CHIPS

It is, I suggest, the looming struggle with Red China that we American must keep in the forefront of our minds as we grope for the right mixture of political and military strategy for ending the mischief in Vietnam. This is why the map shown at the start of this report now grows luminous with meaning. Now, while hoping for a satisfactory outcome in the going war, we should be sensibly preparing the dispositions we shall need if it turns out badly.

The huge naval base at Subic Bay with its fine runways and the Air Force's runways, repair shops, and storage facilities at Clark Field in the Philippines are indispensable for any forward strategy in the Pacific. It stands to reason that the British air establishment and truly superb naval base at Singapore, all greatly refurbished in the past decade are also crucial for the control of the Pacific sea routes and the approaches to Australia and New Zealand. Hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars have been invested in air and sea facilities in Okinawa and Japan. And Japan must itself be persuaded to become the north hinge of any grand strategy scheme in the Pacific.

Then, too, there is Thailand, which has generously opened its geography for new jet airfields. This to me is the most stunning recent development of all. It could have the effect of transforming Thailand from being a weak ground flank on the United States position in South Vietnam into be-

coming the main air-strike position, of which South Vietnam becomes the weak ground flank. And, finally, there are South Korea and Taiwan, the only other friendly countries in the area with large, ready, experienced forces. It seems to me our diplomacy should be cultivating this vast garden with more assiduity than it has shown.

REPUBLICAN INITIATIVES ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's recently announced willingness to participate in an international conference on world monetary reform preceded by a preparatory commission illustrates dramatically the constructive role that the minority party can play in the development of public policy. As the New York Times commented on July 11:

The idea of a world monetary conference can be said to have originated not with the administration but with Congressional Republicans.

As long ago as July, 1963, the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee introduced resolutions in both the House and the Senate urging that the administration take the lead in calling an international conference on monetary reform. Similar resolutions (S. Con. Res. 14; H. Con. Res. 127) were introduced early in the current session of Congress stressing that careful planning and preparation should precede the meeting of the full conference.

As recently as June 28, another member of the Joint Economic Committee, Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, speaking on behalf of himself and a number of other Republican Congressmen, made a major speech on the subject of monetary reform before the House. Among the recommendations in the speech was one calling for the creation of a preparatory commission which could meet in the near future to lay the groundwork for a conference to strengthen the world payments system. Other Republican initiatives in this area have been made for a number of years by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York.

Recently, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, endorsed the idea of a world monetary conference. Finally, the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee gave considerable attention to the need for and the means to achieve international monetary reform in their minority views to the committee's 1965 annual report. Treasury Secretary Fowler's speech of July 10 represented a sudden about-face in the administration's attitude toward the need for early action in this area. I think there can be no doubt that Republican efforts on world monetary reform were important in helping to develop the administration's new and more realistic position.

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190004-5

17974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 28, 1965

Another example in the same area of how a constructive minority party can serve the national interest by clarifying key issues is the work now being done by the task force on Federal fiscal and monetary policies of the Republican coordinating committee. The task force has already held several meetings and is expected to report its policy recommendations to the coordinating committee on August 30, 1965. The task force is composed of a distinguished group of Americans and is chaired by Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, as vice chairman.

Under unanimous consent I include a list of the members of the task force in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The quality of the men and women serving on the task force gives promise that its recommendations will make an important contribution to developing economic policies in the national interest. (The list of members follow:)

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE—TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES

Chairman: Maurice H. Stans, Glore Forgan, William R. Staats, Inc., New York, N.Y.—investment banker; Director Bureau of the Budget, 1958–61; Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, 1957–58; Deputy Postmaster General of the United States, 1955–57; financial consultant to Postmaster General of the United States, 1953–55.

Vice chairman: George Champion, New York, N.Y.—chairman, board of directors, Chase Manhattan Bank; director, Federal Reserve Bank of New York; numerous directorships connected with domestic and foreign finance.

MEMBERS

William H. Avery, Governor of the State of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.: Elected Governor of Kansas in 1964; Member of Congress for

the Second District of Kansas five terms, first elected 1954.

Julian B. Baird, First National Bank, St. Paul, Minn.: Banker; Under Secretary of Treasury for Monetary Affairs, 1957–61.

FRANK T. BOW, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.: Member of Congress for the 16th District of Ohio, first elected to the 82d Congress in 1950; reelected to the 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, and 89th Congresses; ranking Republican member of the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations; member of Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures.

George S. Eccles, Salt Lake City, Utah: Financier; president, First Security Corp.

Mrs. Rosemary Ginn, Columbia, Mo.: National committeewoman for Missouri since July 27, 1960; member of board of directors of the Missouri Stores Co. since 1937.

Cliff Hansen, Governor of the State of Wyoming, Cheyenne, Wyo.: Elected Governor of Wyoming in 1962; active in many interstate programs for conservation and development; connected with livestock industry.

Kenneth C. Kellar, Kellar, Kellar & Driscoll, attorneys at law, Leads, S. Dak.: Monetary expert; chief counsel and vice president of industrial relations, Homestake Mining Co.

Peter O'Donnell, Jr., Dallas, Tex.: Chairman of Republican Party of Texas since September 18, 1962; investment business.

Clarence B. Randall, Chicago, Ill.: Chairman of Council on Foreign Economic Policy, 1956–61; Special Assistant to President Eisenhower on matters of foreign economic policy, 1956–61; Special Consultant to President Eisenhower on Foreign Economic Policy, 1954–56; Chairman of Committee on Foreign Economic Policy, 1953–54; member, Business Advisory Council, U.S. State Department of Commerce, 1951–57; holder of numerous positions in the Federal Government; expert on domestic and foreign business; recipient of many honors and awards.

Raymond J. Saulnier, Barnard College, New York, N.Y.: Consultant to President's Council of Economic Advisers, 1953; appointed member 1955, Chairman 1957; special adviser to the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, 1950–52; teacher and research economist; author of several treatises on financial matters.

Lewis L. Strauss, Washington, D.C.: Secretary of Commerce, 1958–59; Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, 1953–58; corporation and investment executive.

Robert D. Stuart, Jr., Chicago, Ill.: President, Quaker Oats Co.; national committeeman for Illinois since July 1964.

Sinclair Weeks, Lancaster, N.H.: Secretary of Commerce, 1953–58; appointed U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, February–December, 1944; treasurer, Republican National Committee, 1941–44; chairman, Republican National Finance Committee, 1949–52; numerous business interests.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Senator from Delaware, elected 1946; reelected 1952, 1958, and 1964; ranking Republican member of Senate Committee on Finance; member of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

MILL MARGINS UP AGAIN, SO ARE TEXTILE PRICES

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the record of the current \$800 million cotton program gets sorer with each passing month.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture statistical record of 11 months of the first full year has been published—USDA document CS-219.

It reports that mill margins are up again and so are textile prices. Mill margin—the gross difference between raw-cotton cost and 20 basic textile constructions—has climbed each of the 11 months. The textile price index—the foundation for consumer prices—has risen each of these same 11 months.

Here are the statistics, as reported in CS-219, USDA:

TABLE 19.—Fabric value, cotton price, and mill margin, per pound, United States, by months, August 1960 to date

(In cents)

Month	Fabric value (20 constructions) ¹					Cotton price ²					Mill margin ³				
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
August	62.86	58.78	61.12	60.60	61.00	32.52	34.48	35.89	35.22	27.64	30.34	23.94	25.23	25.27	33.36
September	61.90	59.78	60.83	60.99	61.02	32.25	35.16	35.23	35.19	26.82	29.65	24.62	25.70	25.80	34.20
October	60.64	60.32	60.71	61.34	61.25	32.05	35.35	35.08	35.11	26.80	28.59	24.97	25.63	26.23	34.45
November	60.98	60.45	60.68	62.00	61.48	31.99	35.46	35.10	35.27	26.98	27.99	24.99	25.68	26.73	34.50
December	58.61	60.54	60.67	62.29	62.58	32.00	35.58	35.30	35.37	27.30	26.61	24.96	25.37	26.92	35.24
January	58.06	60.63	60.55	62.32	63.24	32.01	35.78	34.45	35.47	27.30	26.05	24.85	25.10	26.85	35.94
February	57.78	60.76	60.47	62.37	63.28	32.41	35.82	35.66	35.55	27.26	25.37	24.94	24.81	26.82	36.02
March	57.64	61.07	60.49	62.37	63.42	32.32	35.98	35.95	35.58	27.26	24.32	25.09	24.54	26.79	36.16
April	57.46	61.23	60.26	61.82	63.89	33.56	35.85	36.08	35.63	27.40	24.00	25.38	24.18	26.19	36.49
May	57.54	61.19	60.00	61.29	64.65	33.86	36.13	36.16	35.67	27.35	23.68	25.05	23.84	25.62	37.30
June	57.60	61.24	60.11	60.62	64.85	34.09	36.34	35.86	35.76	27.36	23.51	24.90	24.25	24.86	37.49
July	57.88	61.29	60.28	60.95	-----	34.45	36.19	35.57	35.60	-----	23.43	25.10	24.71	25.35	-----
Crop-year average ⁴	59.00	60.61	60.52	61.58	-----	32.87	35.71	35.61	35.46	-----	26.13	24.90	24.91	26.12	-----

¹ The estimated value of cloth obtainable from a pound of cotton with adjustments for salable waste.

² Monthly average prices for four territory growths, even running lots, prompt shipments, delivered at group 201 (group B) mill points including landing costs and brokerage. Prices are for the average quality cotton used in each kind of cloth. Beginning August 1964, prices are for cotton after equalization payments of 6.5 cents per pound have been made. The mill margins shown for April–July 1964 do not reflect

the 6.5 cents per pound equalization payment made to domestic cotton users on all bales of eligible cotton opened beginning 12:01 a.m. April 11, 1964, through July 31, 1964.

³ Difference between cloth prices and cotton prices.

⁴ Starts Aug. 1 of the year indicated.

Source: Cotton Division, Consumer and Marketing Service.

The Government-held carryover of cotton on August 1, 1965, is now predicted at 14.2 million bales—only 200,000 bales less than the alltime record of 1956.

The same USDA bulletin reports that cotton textile exports were down 24 percent during the first 4 months of this year, compared with the same period of the previous year.

Textile imports are up 20 percent for the first 5 months of this year compared with the same 5 months of 1964.

The question arises: What are the taxpayers getting for the \$800 million spent on this program?

One final somber note: The cotton proposal recently reported by the Committee on Agriculture offers no hope that this sad situation will be remedied.

DELEGATE CONTRIBUTIONS BY CONGRESSMAN TOM CURTIS PRAISED BY THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the deep respect and affection with which our colleague, TOM CURTIS is regarded in St. Louis County became very clear to me early this year when I spent a week as a visiting government official in residence at Washington University. The intelligence and vigor of the young men and women attending that institution and the searching questions of the faculty made a very vivid impact on me. During the week of sharing with young people from all over the Nation my impressions of the governmental process I was accompanied by a St. Louis Globe-Democrat reporter and photographer who produced a report on the type of issues and attitudes young Americans have today. It is therefore with first-hand knowledge of the St. Louis scene that I read with interest recently the editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 24-25, 1965, entitled "Missouri's Man at Geneva."

In New York City we probably have the greatest number of men and women who are active in the fields of international trade and the expansion thereof found anywhere in the world. Civic leaders in New York for many years have taken the leadership in American in helping to expand commerce between nations. TOM CURTIS' work as one of the U.S. delegation for trade negotiations is therefore another indication of his willingness to assume difficult work producing projects which help create more jobs for our people. TOM CURTIS' careful scholarship and hard work can do more to influence favorably the difference between war and peace based on economics than many other things which take place. He is showing what responsible internationalism in economics really is like. Because of my work in connection with NATO, I am fully aware of the difficulties which confront the trade and tariff negotiations. But as one who worked alongside TOM CURTIS for the expansion and renewal of reci-

procal trade legislation, I am pleased to see that much of the work which he and his staff do every week without any public recognition is being given credit in one of the places where it counts the most, St. Louis County. I am pleased that the editors of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat have taken the leadership in bringing to the attention of TOM CURTIS' friends and neighbors the importance of leadership by the United States in making the GATT negotiations really reciprocal and helping to create more jobs and business opportunities for all our people.

The article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat follows:

MISSOURI'S MAN AT GENEVA

One of the more significant legislative achievements of the late President John F. Kennedy was passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Under it the President was given sweeping authorization to reduce and eliminate tariffs on U.S. imports, in return for reciprocal cuts from nations to which this country sells.

The sixth round of tariff negotiations—under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—which began May 4, 1964, is a natural outgrowth of that legislation. While there has been no dramatic success to date in this so-called Kennedy round of negotiations, there yet remains the possibility of a successful conclusion, beneficial to world trade and hence the United States.

But it will require judicious, relentless, and tough bargaining by American negotiators to realize that objective before expiration of the Presidential powers of the Trade Expansion Act on June 30, 1967.

That is the opinion of Webster Groves Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, the only member of the four-man congressional delegation to have thus far gone to Geneva to sit in on these negotiations, so critical to this country and to Missouri.

TOM CURTIS is regarded as the most astute and informed man on foreign trade in Congress.

According to Mr. CURTIS, America's original goal of a 50-percent reduction in agricultural and industrial tariffs now appears unrealistic. Negotiations on farm commodities have been delayed pending Common Market progress in formulating a common agricultural policy.

America is rightly reluctant to have bargaining on industrial tariffs get too far ahead of agricultural tariffs—as industrial concessions are all we have to induce Europeans to give us greater access to their agricultural markets.

The stake of Missouri and Illinois farmers in these negotiations is considerable.

One can readily imagine the complexity of multilateral trade negotiations involving modern capitalist states which must not only look out for adverse impacts upon emerging nations, but must also answer to numerous and politically powerful economic interests at home—for their every decision.

But one can also visualize the benefits that would accrue to men from the removal of artificial barriers against the free flows of goods. The United States—and the Common Market of Europe to a lesser degree—give some idea of the economic progress that can be made when there are few or no barriers to commerce.

We shall have a clearer picture of the prospects for success in the Kennedy round by fall.

(Mr. WALKER of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WALKER of Mississippi's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the ever-growing serious situation in Vietnam, I wish to call to the attention of this House the views I expressed in a communication to the President of the United States on July 24, 1965, in which I call for a more resolute determination on the part of our country in imploring the United Nations to intercede to bring an end to the hostilities in southeast Asia.

Specifically, I urged the President to direct our representative in the United Nations to call on the General Assembly for authorization to dispatch a peace-keeping mission to Vietnam.

It has been my continuing conviction that this is a forthright step that must be taken. We must let the world know in no uncertain terms of our determination for peace, and we must have faith that dedicated men of good will will make this possible.

My letter to the President reads as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The situation in Vietnam is becoming more difficult and more deadly with each passing week. In the 3-month period from April through June 1965, 8,000 men have been killed in this war. And we are told that the war will get worse before it gets better.

If we cast but a glance at the sweep of history, we see other wars, provoked by other problems, and fought by other participants. We see, for example, that World War I took the lives of 8½ million men, and we ask ourselves if there was not another, a wiser course that might have been followed—a course that could have spared the bloodshed, the heartache, and the death that ravaged so many young men.

History deals harshly with the national leaders who failed to halt that futile slaughter. In retrospect, it always appears that wars could either have been obviated or contained. It is our responsibility today to project ourselves into the future and endeavor to discern those alternative responses available to the United States, which, if fully prosecuted now, can shorten or end this war. In view of the intransigent and inflexible posture of the leaders in Hanoi and Peking, I am convinced that our one hope lies with the United Nations and the uncommitted nations of the world. I therefore urge that we continue, more resolutely than ever, to implore the United Nations to intercede to bring an end to the hostilities in Vietnam.

Dag Hammarskjöld once wrote: "Next will come a demand about which you already know all you need to know; that its sole measure is your own strength."

I realize that our Government has made efforts to secure United Nations intervention, but I know, too, that ours is a strong Nation, strong enough to be persistent in its pleas for peace.

I am aware that in May of 1964, we proposed that a U.N. task force be established on the border which joins Cambodia with

South Vietnam, to investigate the incidents then taking place. In August of 1964, we requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the serious situation created by North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on two U.S. destroyers in the open sea. In April of 1965, U Thant offered to visit several world capitals in an effort to explore the possibility of working out a solution to this problem.

The President of India also suggested the possibility of a patrol force, to which his country would contribute.

All of these overtures, together with your offer to participate in unconditional discussions, were flatly rejected and ridiculed by Hanoi and Peiping, who concern themselves more with the mantle of glory and with power, than with honor and the opinions of mankind.

History will record our efforts, but let not historians write that after half a dozen attempts, the United States abandoned its search for a peaceful solution. Rather, let us use every means at our disposal to convince the world of our good will and to unite with others in the cause of peace.

Specifically, I urge that you direct our representative to the United Nations to call on the General Assembly for the authorization to dispatch a peacekeeping mission to Vietnam.

I should certainly hope that the 17 nonaligned nations—whose plea for discussions we accepted—would be the first to volunteer forces for a mission designed to promote the peace they so earnestly desire. I should hope that the small nations and the young nations, which profit so from United Nations membership, would recognize the responsibility concomitant to that membership, and would also provide peacekeepers. If the United States must bear an inordinate share of the cost of transporting, equipping, and maintaining this force, I think we should be willing to accept this as the price of leadership in a troubled world.

This peacekeeping force would function like its predecessors in the Congo and the Middle East. It could be deployed along the 17th parallel and down the border of Laos. It would have to be highly mobilized, with a significant aerial reconnaissance capability. We could pledge to stop our bombing of North Vietnam, once this force made substantial inroads, in thwarting infiltration from the North, and from Laos. With this as a first step, areas of amnesty and of safety could be delimited and secured so that the civilian population could be spared from the scourge of war. Eventually, perhaps, even greater strides could be taken and greater accomplishments recorded.

This is no simple solution, no complete answer. But it is a crucial step, at a critical juncture, and I believe it is a step which must be taken. I am convinced that we have enough men of talent and intelligence in this world, enough men dedicated to peace, to make this work.

I believe that the United States must continue to show the world that we are sincere in our quest for peace, and I believe that we must show our adversaries that they seek glory in vain, who seek it in war, and that in the words of Milton:

"If there be in glory aught of good,
It may be means far different be attained,
Without ambition, war or violence;
By deeds of peace, by wisdom eminent,
By patience (and by) temperance."

Very sincerely,

SEYMOUR HALPERN,
Member of Congress.

PEOPLE SPEAK NO MORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] made a few remarks about me but he would not yield for the purpose of setting the record straight. He referred to the fact that most of my district had voted against the right-to-work referendum in 1958. This is most certainly true. As he alleges, the people did speak.

They did not speak on this issue, however. What the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and the other Members of his party are saying is that they should not be allowed to speak. That is the fundamental issue. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of my constituents believe that Ohioans should have the right to determine this matter without Federal dictation. The entire Ohio Democrat delegation is evidently committed to the principle of concentrating more and more power and decision-making authority here in Washington and depriving the people of more and more of their sovereign rights.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the people speak and I listened to them. I am not one who wants to silence them. I am content to let them speak as often as they choose. Our fundamental responsibility is to represent them, to listen to them, not to muzzle them and dictate to them.

On that issue the two major parties divide rather distinctly and I am personally glad that the Republican Party is overwhelmingly committed to a policy which will not deprive our people of the right to decide these matters by their own referendum or their own legislature. To listen to my colleagues you would think, if they are consistent, that the fact the people of Ohio vote "no" on a referendum would indicate they want to abolish their right to conduct such a referendum. This is what they are saying when they rely on the 1958 vote to buttress their otherwise weak and meaningless arguments.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read a speech by Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton delivered to the Associated General Contractors of America in which he enunciated a welcome thesis—that highways have a social responsibility which transcends the basic function of transporting people and goods.

Mr. Whitton who is in charge of administering the huge Federal-aid highway program declared that in the planning, location, design, and construction of highways greater consideration than heretofore must be given to their impact on people for whom they are provided.

As Representative of New Jersey's 15th Congressional District, which is crisscrossed by highways carrying heavy traffic between New York and Philadelphia, and between New York and Washington, I am aware of the contributions modern, high-capacity, fast, and safe highways make to the Nation's well-

being and to lessening the traffic accident rate. I also recognize the difficulties involved in constructing highways through heavily populated urban areas. Nevertheless, I had been somewhat apprehensive about the effects of highways on people and the communities in which they live. I felt that special efforts should be expended to minimize disruption of existing community and neighborhood values, and that the welfare of people must always be paramount.

Whatever misgivings I have had have now been allayed by the Nation's No. 1 roadbuilder whose concern for humanizing highway construction should be hailed by all Americans. In the final analysis, a functional, well-engineered highway falls short of serving its full purpose if it does not preserve the esthetic, cultural, historical, and social values so important to our way of life.

Mr. Whitton, under whose aegis the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System is proceeding successfully, is exercising commendable leadership in the highway program. I am confident my colleagues will be extremely interested in his speech on social responsibility that follows:

HIGHWAYS HAVE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

(Remarks by Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, at the National Highway Conference sponsored by the Associated General Contractors of America, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., July 20, 1965)

I am happy to join you today in this national highway conference; and I want to congratulate the Associated General Contractors of America for sponsoring it. The stated purposes of the conference show the depth of your interest, covering as they do both the present and the future. And they show your breadth of interest, too, ranging from the specifications that govern your work, to the impact of your work on the public.

I am sure that the major topics of your conference program are being discussed thoroughly by the fine speakers and panel members scheduled. And I am sure that, as usual, some sharp questions are being asked from the floor. I would guess that the fielding is at least better than the ball clubs manage here in Washington and back home in Missouri.

What I want to talk about with you today is a topic that would have seemed totally unfitting for a contractors' assembly a generation ago. But my theme today, "Highways Have Social Responsibilities," is reflected in your concern about the contracting industry's relations with the traveling public.

When I look back over the many years I have spent in the highway field, I become aware of the increasing efforts many of you have been making toward creating a better public understanding of your work. But the public understanding and appreciation of your work, is created, and can be improved—by only one basic means: consideration of the public. And that consideration must be gaged in terms of the present, not the past. Take, for example, the rutted, dusty, or muddy backroad detour that commonly wandered remotely around the construction project of a generation ago. The drivers of that day gritted their teeth and accepted such detours as a necessary evil. Yet their forefathers, who crossed the untracked land in prairie schooners, would have considered those detours pretty fair roads. Not so their descendants, to whom comfort and convenience are the norm, not the exception.

And as they pass by or through your operation, that is what they judge you by. Motorists are unimpressed by or even unaware

Community Development Service, Department of Agriculture, sent you concerning an inquiry from Mr. Charles Nelson, mayor of the town of Orient, Iowa. Perhaps I can best supply the information you desire.

About 2 years ago members of my staff and myself met with the local council in Orient to explore the possibility of their cooperating in the watershed project. Under the watershed program administered by the Soil Conservation Service, consideration can be given to benefits of a water supply to a municipality, for recreation; as well as flood control. Had a watershed been developed, there was a possibility that part of the costs incurred in providing a water supply for the municipality would have been included as a part of the cost of the project.

Orient is located on Highway 25 midway between Creston and Greenfield. The present population of 341 represents a decline from 427 in 1950. The town has neither a water system nor a sanitary sewer system. The people in the community are aggressive and interested in acquiring both water and sewer for their residences.

This past year the town contracted with an engineer and had several test wells drilled. Preliminary estimates place the cost at around \$115,000 for an adequate system. A bonding program was scheduled which included \$39,508 general obligation bonds; \$44,250 special assessment bonds; and \$50,000 in revenue bonds. The general obligation and revenue bonds would draw 5-percent interest and special assessment bonds would accrue at the 6-percent interest rate. Initially, the plan was based on 100 users. An election on May 12 rejected the plan by a substantial majority.

Mr. Charles Nelson, mayor of Orient, heard about our effort to help the town of Clearfield and contacted our office on May 6, 1965. Mr. Kenneth Bower, a member of my staff, called on two of the council members and discussed our soil and water association loans to help small towns provide water systems. They were very much interested and asked that we meet with the council and other members of the community.

On May 19, Mr. Bower attended a meeting of the council with the city attorney present. Potential possibilities of a water system were discussed, recognizing that at least 100 community users would be needed to make the plan feasible. After the council discussion, a group of approximately 40 local residents met at the schoolhouse and raised a number of questions relative to the proposal. A majority of those present were senior citizens. Many of them have low incomes and the cost of water was a very important factor in their decision. Even these senior citizens recognize, however, the importance of both water and sewer if their community is to remain alive, thrive, and grow. Plans were made for a house-to-house survey to determine actual interest in continuing with plans for FHA assistance.

Several times during the meeting questions were asked as to availability of grants to assist small towns in efforts to install both water and sewage systems. John, I am sorry we had to tell them that such assistance is not presently available. Frankly, they cannot understand, and I am unable to give any feasible explanation, as to why larger municipalities are eligible for various types of grant assistance and small towns are not.

There are 707 towns in Iowa with a population of under 1,000. Over 300 of these towns have inadequate water or sewage systems. Many of the wells in these rural communities are contaminated. They do not afford even meager fire protection. In many of them the majority of the residents are senior citizens. They want to retire where they have spent the major portion of their life and in their own home environment.

John, you are aware of the personal position I have taken for years with respect to preservation of our rural communities. We can't move all of the people in rural communities into Des Moines, Cedar Rapids, Waterloo, Omaha, et cetera. Yet if these small communities are going to grow, they must be able to offer the same services of water and sewage and even credit for modest housing. This is necessary if we are going to entice and keep our young families in these communities.

The town of Orient is a classic example. It is well located near the industrial center of Creston and the local citizens feel that many younger people would prefer to live in Orient and would probably build homes if water and sewer were available. School districts have been reorganized in the Orient vicinity and they have both a grade and high school in the town. It is quite likely that this situation will not be disturbed in the foreseeable future. Assistance in helping defray the cost of water and sewer installation would be a justifiable investment by the Government. A modest 25 percent contribution in the form of a grant would make this project feasible and do much to stabilize the community.

John, I am sure that both you and I recognize that any grant assistance that could be made available to provide essential services to our small communities is as important to our Nation as grant and aid given to urban development. Future investment in rural communities could be much less costly than that which has already been incurred in handling displaced rural people in urban areas.

We shall continue to work with the town of Orient and hope that a feasible project can be developed to provide a safe and sanitary water system and offer some fire protection. If we make the loan I assume they will make the personal sacrifice of paying high monthly rentals which will be necessary to repay it. If on the other hand, funds were available to make a grant for part of the costs, the senior citizen in Orient could enjoy the water while he used and paid for it.

Sincerely yours,

GENE L. HOFFMAN,
 State Director.

Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent matter for many of our small communities and I hope the House of Representatives will move with dispatch on this measure. Those of us in rural America feel that the effective work being done in the urban centers by HHFA should be duplicated in our sections of the Nation.

USDA: CONSUMER FRIEND—RESEARCH KEEPS PACE WITH CHANGING FOOD NEEDS

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, any American housewife who, in the fashion of Rip Van Winkle, had returned after an absence of 20 years to a supermarket would not recognize the place. A revolution has taken place. But, and I think this is unfortunate, only a minority are aware that the revolution in food is the end product of research carried on by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations.

USDA and the Florida Citrus Commission developed the frozen orange juice concentrate that opened the way for many other frozen concentrates.

USDA developed instant potatoes and sweetpotatoes and dehydrofrozen fruits and vegetables.

USDA greatly improved powered skim milk, dried eggs, and cake mixes.

USDA and State research helped to make sweet corn sweeter and fresh strawberries and blueberries bigger and juicier than they used to be, to give potatoes smoother skins, and to free fruits and vegetables of some diseases.

USDA researchers have developed mechanical means of probing, pinching, testing, peering into, and measuring produce to determine its quality and grade.

Research in USDA and the State experiment stations in breeding, producing, protecting, and marketing livestock and poultry have helped to make chicken and turkey meat convenient, delicious, and inexpensive, beef tender and flavorful, bacon leaner; milk and butter plentiful, and eggs fresh in flavor.

Many other new foods, I understand, are moving from USDA and State research laboratories toward commercial manufacture and consumers' grocery bags.

Among these new foods that will shortly tempt the American palate and provide new convenience are dry whole milk and low-fat cheese, gelled applesauce, low-calorie peanuts, a high-protein flour made from cottonseed, and "dry" tomato and fruit juices that store on the pantry shelf.

An explosion-puffing dehydration process promises a whole new family of quick-cooking convenience foods. Already this process has created instant blueberries, carrots, turnips, beets, apples, and applesauce.

All that the future holds no man can tell. But of this I am fairly sure: Those who share it will be eating foods which have come from USDA Consumer Research.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

John Corman
 VIETNAM

(Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to ex-

17984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 28, 1965

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson today reaffirmed this Nation's intention to make certain that the people of South Vietnam will not be swallowed up by the insatiable appetite of Communist aggression.

He has restated our commitment to give the valiant people of that strife-torn nation the opportunity to shape their own destiny and not be used as a cold war pawn.

But, at the same time, the President has again extended an open hand to the North Vietnamese Government to sit down with us at a conference table in hopes of achieving an honorable peace. Mr. Johnson has made a significant step toward that peace today by dispatching Ambassador Goldberg to the United Nations to present Secretary General U Thant with a letter requesting that this prestigious council of nations use all its resources to end the war in Vietnam and bring peace to southeast Asia.

I wish to express my support for President Johnson's action and state that I am heartily in favor of the steps he is taking to enlist the support of the United Nations in our attempts to find a peaceful solution to the strife in Vietnam. I also wish to state that the people of my district have overwhelmingly expressed their approval of the President's policies in Vietnam, and I am confident that as long as he continues to seek unconditional negotiations without jeopardizing our military security, the people of the 22d District of California and their representative in this House will stand behind him.

The President is to be commended for his decisive action today and his sincere efforts to achieve a lasting and honorable peace in Vietnam.

For Mr. Clark
VIETNAM

(Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my thoughts on President Johnson's talk to the American people today on the Vietnam situation. I approve of his actions wholeheartedly. He knows the problems better than any other American, and he is the sole leader in foreign policy. President Johnson is the one who must make the decisions on any and all matters in this connection. I compliment him on his forthright actions in the past and I support him 100 percent.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

(Mr. HUOT (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, recently certain votes which I have cast in the House of Representatives have been criti-

cized by a group calling itself the Republican Congressional Committee. Naturally I recognize the right of any group to criticize my policies even though such attacks might be politically motivated. However, these charges have been so misleading and irresponsible that I feel they should be corrected. I am confident that my responsible Republican friends would not wish to be associated with such unprincipled attacks.

I was criticized for having supported the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which provides rent subsidies for low-income families who presently live in slum conditions. What the critics failed to report was that only those families eligible for public housing can qualify for assistance under this act. The vast majority of deserving families have incomes under \$4,500 per year. Furthermore, in order to receive help the family must first pay one-quarter of its income toward the rental payment. The eligible housing must be modest in design and will be privately owned, privately constructed, privately financed, and privately operated. Naturally I was shocked to hear this group criticize a program that will help private enterprise meet the needs of low-income housing, particularly since the program has the full support of the banking industry, homebuilding industry, and construction industry.

I was also criticized for having voted against the so-called clean elections amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Of course any registration drive whether in the South or conducted by a legitimate political party could well be forbidden by the amendment. I suspect its intent was to vitiate the provisions of the very Voting Rights Act to which it was attached.

It is indeed unfortunate that this group, whomever it represents, displays its inability to respond to the legitimate need of the American people by resorting to such negative, irresponsible tactics. I felt it was incumbent upon me to bring these charges to the attention of the House of Representatives so that the legitimate Republican Congressional Committee could have an opportunity to disavow its authorship.

For Mr. Duncan
VIETNAM

(Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, surely no one can envy the task of the President of the United States in these days of trial and danger in southeast Asia. But just as surely no one can deny the care, the dedication, the industry, the study, and even the humility with which he approaches this task so distasteful to him and to the American people. One cannot question his agonizing search for a peaceful solution consistent with our concepts of freedom and with the longrun best interests of the United States. Nor can one question his determination to protect and advance

those interests of freedom and of this country which are, in effect, parallel.

While doubts are expressed—and should be expressed in any free society—I am convinced that the vast majority of the American people, indeed, the overwhelming majority, are in support of the President's carefully measured responses to the exigencies of the hour. Our every action has been and is consistent with what may seem to be our ambivalent techniques of negotiation and warfare. Yet both have a common objective: peace, and the preservation of freedom.

I have often thought, and sometimes said over the past 15 or more years, that history would reveal that the most grievous error of American foreign policy occurred in China following the end of World War II. While Chiang Kai-shek was and is no paragon of virtue in the eyes of many, the fact remains that he had been fighting the battle of the free world against the then-enemy, fascism, for many years and long before any other part of the world was involved.

Weary as we were, we should never have permitted the consolidation of China in the hands of those espousing a philosophy called by another name—communism—but utilizing the same techniques of repression, terror and aggression, and further dedicated to the domination of the world.

Had that battle been fought, this battle which we unhappily have had thrust upon us, would have been avoided. If we do not fight this battle now, the consequences on the morrow can be no better and, if we read the teachings of history correctly, will be much worse.

Time after time this philosophy, which must advance or it decays, has thrust itself out into the free world in salient after salient. Subversion of the economic and parliamentary processes in western Europe blockades, guerilla uprisings, conventional warfare—all have been repulsed by the free world led by the United States, and principally on the initiative of the United States. This new technique, called a "war of national liberation," has been repulsed in the Congo; it must be repulsed in South Vietnam. If it is not, they grow stronger and we grow weaker with each bite. If it is, the decay and rot, which is inherent at the core of the system, will solve many of the other problems which face us around the world.

Were we faced only with an idea, different though it might be from our own, which peoples of the world were being asked to accept in free competition with ours, then our position would be untenable. This is not the nature of the threat, however, as we all know. I am, nevertheless, delighted that the President saw fit to reaffirm our belief in free elections, in the south or throughout all Vietnam. The day of free elections in that unhappy part of the world is not yet here. But we have the courage, the tenacity and the strength to see that it one day comes. And to the extent that freedom is impaired, even in far-off Vietnam, our own freedom is that much less secure.

The prayers of the people of my district go with and sustain the President and this country.

July 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17985

(Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

**"THE FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION"—
SPEECH BY MR. WILLARD SIMMONS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
OF N.A.R.D. AT HOUSTON, TEX.,
JULY 20, 1965**

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Willard B. Simmons, executive secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists, in a recent appearance before the Texas Pharmaceutical Association at Houston, Tex., on July 20, 1965, made a number of thought-provoking and cogent observations regarding the nature of freedom in our democratic society. Mr. Simmons also discussed the intricate and significant relationship of professional and business associations on the local, State, and National levels. Mr. Simmons' remarks, set forth below, are of value to all students of the American business scene:

THE FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

(Address by Willard B. Simmons, executive secretary, National Association of Retail Druggists, before the Texas Pharmaceutical Association at Houston, Tex., July 20, 1965)

May I begin by thanking you for your invitation to participate in this most significant meeting. Much of value to you and to pharmacy is at stake at this convention.

We are dealing here with the subject of affiliation. I think you know the attitude of the N.A.R.D. on this subject. But you have generously asked me to come here personally to express my views, and I am glad to respond.

First, of course, let me say that it's good to be home in Texas. I've travelled many, many thousands of miles in the past 5 years of my service to pharmacy through my work with the N.A.R.D. I've had the pleasure and privilege of addressing many of the State pharmaceutical associations at their annual conventions and on countless other occasions.

Pharmacy is most fortunate in the individual and collective strength of its State, metropolitan and local pharmaceutical associations. Here in Texas we have a great State association. I want to take this opportunity of expressing my personal pleasure at the continual and continuing progress made by the State association in behalf of its members and of pharmacy as a whole. And I extend congratulations to the officers of the association, now and over the years, as well as to the many who have served it faithfully as directors on the wonderful work you have done to make this progress possible. Finally, I want to note the devotion and loyalty to and participation in the affairs of the association of the members which have inspired your leaders to exceptional effort.

Let me make it clear. I appear here as a Texan, as one who has been a member—and a reasonably active one—of the association since 1928. I confess to a wholehearted impartial bias in favor of Texas, the Texas

Pharmaceutical Association, and pharmacy. But I want you to know that since associating myself with the direct operation of the N.A.R.D. some 5 years ago, I have developed a similar impartial bias in favor of the State, metropolitan, and local associations throughout the country who, like the Texas group, are working with might and main in their own spheres to advance the interest of their members and of the profession of pharmacy.

But I'd like to make one thing clear as I approach the subject with which you are concerned here today. Though Texas is my home State, though this is where I raised a family and built a business, though the major part of my life has been spent with and among you—notwithstanding these facts, I want you to know that I neither seek nor ask a sympathetic hearing on that account for my point of view respecting affiliation. I ask only that you hear me out, and I promise not to hold the platform for too long a time.

The essence of the difference of opinion regarding affiliation, and there is a very marked difference of opinion, can be summed up in one word on the lips of every American since the birth of the Republic. The word is freedom. You are here to decide, now or later, whether you or the pharmacists who come after you shall have the right individually to join, or not to join, any national organization in pharmacy. It's as simple as that. This is what is involved in the question of affiliation of the Texas Pharmaceutical Association with the American Pharmaceutical Association. And beyond this fact are implications which challenge the thinking of every person in this room.

Let me add an observation or two about freedom. I mean freedom as we Americans understand it, not the mock freedom of dictatorship as it has been known through the ages and as we see it in operation today. Freedom is the key word of every democratic society. "Perfect freedom," an American observed, "is as necessary to the health and vigor of commerce as it is to the health and vigor of statesmanship." And, may I add, to the health and vigor of pharmacy. Thomas Jefferson defined freedom as "the right to choose; the right to create for oneself the alternative of choice." And I could cite an encyclopedia full of quotations that uphold the democratic principle of the right of the individual—without coercion, without being dragged by the heels—to say yes or no, the right to choose from two or a host of alternatives.

"Give light and the people will find their own way," proclaims the masthead of the Scripps-Howard chain of daily newspapers. I'm not at all sure that it is necessary to throw further light on the subject of affiliation to the members of the Texas association; for, unless I misunderstand the people of my State, Texans prize their independence, and sell it to nobody for any price however attractive, or any promise however fanciful or alluring.

It is up to each of us in pharmacy to achieve an individual identity, and to retain that identity. We can do so, I submit, by the simple process of refusing to abdicate our respective wills and freedom. There is no professional, business or personal security or advancement in delegating our individual powers of action and decision to a monolithic power, whether governmental, organizational or individual.

I am more than ever convinced that the basic premises of affiliation are unsound, whether the organization to be affiliated with is the APA or N.A.R.D., or any other group.

It is said—and I've heard it times without number—that affiliation will enable pharmacy to speak with one powerful voice. One voice sounds so nice to the ear, in print looks so appealing to the eye. And it soothes the mind. Of course, ladies and gentlemen, the various associations in pharmacy speak as with one voice on matters on which there

is common cause and consent. But there are differences of opinion among the many groups that make up pharmacy. I am sure that the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy would bridle at the thought that once voice in pharmacy might have the power to proclaim a policy which the deans thought prejudicial to the best interests of their institutions, and the deans would be quick to reject dictation from the A.Ph.A. even though the president-elect is Dean Linwood Tice of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science.

And who among you believes that the American College of Apothecaries would allow any other organization to presume to speak for it when, by so doing, the interests of the ACA members might be adversely affected? And the same holds true for the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists, notwithstanding the fact that Grover Bowles is the current president of the A.Ph.A. And who believes that these other organizations would stand idly by as the one appointed or self-appointed voice of pharmacy takes public positions contrary to those which these organizations, individually or collectively, would oppose—or oppose policies that they would favor? I refer to the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, American Foundation for Pharmaceutical Education, Federal Wholesale Druggists' Association, National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, National Association of Chain Drug Stores, National Pharmaceutical Council, National Wholesale Druggists' Association, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and Proprietary Association. This is by no means a complete list of the national organizations in or related to pharmacy; but it dramatizes, I think, the sheer futility of the undertaking to find or to create one voice for pharmacy.

I mentioned Grover Bowles a moment ago. I respect him and I respect his views in behalf of hospital pharmacy. But I couldn't disagree with him more. Nor he with me on that subject. For I believe as do the overwhelming number of independent retail pharmacists of the land that tax-free hospital pharmacies in their outpatient operations compete unfairly with the 55,000 tax-paying community pharmacies. And, of course, Mr. Bowles is in complete disagreement with me on that score.

While affiliations cannot achieve one voice for pharmacy, it can, however, succeed—if that's the right word—in depriving the Texas Pharmaceutical Association of a measure of its identity, a portion of its freedom, a part of its strength and a degree of member participation in its affairs. What I suggest isn't idle speculation. Take a look at associations that have voted affiliation. The information I get from these States indicates a drying up of member interest in State association activities, a submergence of the State association to a national heterogeneous group, and a dropoff in new memberships. In one State, I am told, some 2,500 pharmacists eligible for membership in the State association decline nevertheless to become members.

Is there anybody here who does not understand what affiliation with the A.Ph.A. entails? The ground rules that A.Ph.A. has fixed for affiliation remind me of the popular song of a few years back, entitled "Love and Marriage." You remember the lyrics have a fine line that goes like this: "You can't have one without the other."

A.Ph.A. conceived affiliation as making membership in its organization mandatory to anyone and everyone who was, or wanted to become, a member of the pharmaceutical association of his or her State. Doesn't that bear a resemblance to the so-called shotgun wedding? Or does it remind you of the tie-in sale known to merchandising?

Putting it still another way, affiliation as it was conceived might be likened to block-booking. This was a practice by which theater owners interested in booking a major

film attraction were forced by the producing company to take a whole catalog of grade B films along with the big feature. The Supreme Court of the United States, by the way, held that blockbooking is an antitrust violation, and motion picture blockbooking was stopped.

Under affiliation, the Texas association would, sooner or later, decline to a position of inferiority in relation to the A.Ph.A. It would be sooner without a grandfather clause in your affiliation resolution, for affiliation would require every single member of the Texas association to become a member of A.Ph.A. or lose membership in the State association. On top of that, A.Ph.A. could have other members who are not members of the State association at all. And, of course, no person could in the future join the State association without first becoming a member of the A.Ph.A. The grandfather clause, incidentally, would exempt present members of the State association from the mandatory requirement that they join A.Ph.A. as a condition of membership in the State association.

In other words, those associations which have accepted affiliation with the grandfather clause have, in effect, sought to bind, without their consent, the nonmembers of the State association and the future pharmacists of their States.

In short, as conceived, it would be clearly impossible—immediately or in the future—for your State association to have as great numerical strength as A.Ph.A. right here in our State of Texas.

As affiliation is conceived by its proponents, a pharmacist—withstanding his qualifications and eligibility—could not be allowed to become a member of the Texas Pharmaceutical Association if he refused to become a member of A.Ph.A. I wonder what possible benefit, what contribution to harmony and unity, can come to the State association by refusing membership to those eligible and who want to join.

Imagine Texas playing second fiddle to anybody or anything. Yet that is the risk you run in voting affiliation. You run the risk of no longer being master in your own house. You run the risk of being forced to surrender your prerogative of screening, qualifying, and accepting new members as you see fit. You run the risk of finding others governing your decisions in the critical area of membership qualification. Indeed, you may well be vesting others with authority enough to wipe the Texas association out of existence.

There's still another risk you face with affiliation. It involves your pocketbook. Current dues of A. Ph. A. are \$25 per year. Who is to say that the dues might not be hiked to \$35, \$50—even \$100 in the years ahead? Does that sound preposterous? Ladies and gentlemen, the Federal income tax started at 1 percent back in 1913. It's somewhat higher today. And let me again remind you of this fact: If dues are raised and you don't want to pay the higher levy then you not only lose membership in the national organization, you are automatically dropped from the membership roll of the Texas Pharmaceutical Association. That would not be good for you, for the State association, for anybody.

Maybe, as of now, these forebodings seem unlikely to come to pass. Yet, how often have we heard the expression, it can't happen here? And the companion bit of oratorical self-assurance, it can't happen to me? As the history books and our own diaries can tell us, it often happens nevertheless.

A business association is not a union. Nor is a professional association. Your value as an association is based not on exclusivity, particularly if the rules provide for exclusion on considerations completely outside the professional and practical realm. If we believe, and I am sure we do, that the best purposes

of pharmacy are served by organizations—at all levels of geography—then it goes without saying that those organizations will best serve who have the best programs. Organizations such as these, organizations like the Texas Pharmaceutical Association, will then flourish because they have earned the right to large membership by the service they have given.

In thinking on the subject of affiliation, I have attempted to understand the motivations of those who advocate and those who support the idea of having a monolithic national association which, in fact, would relegate State and local pharmaceutical associations to the status of satellites. Perhaps the proponents of affiliation believe that the existence of an all-powerful national group removes the necessity for having local groups. Perhaps they feel that vigorous, effective local groups dilute, to some extent, the prestige of the national organization. For my part, State and local pharmaceutical associations offer meaningful and valuable benefits without which the profession of pharmacy would suffer.

I have always felt that a pharmacist was well advised to support his local and State pharmaceutical associations. I have likewise felt that he should join the national pharmaceutical association or an association which represents his personal and professional interests, needs, and objectives. Duplication in the services provided by national, State, and local associations can be very little or none at all.

A captain of American industry observed not long ago that "there is a price tag on liberty. That price is the willingness to assume the responsibilities of being freemen. Payment of this price is a personal matter with each of us. It is not something we can get others to pay for. To let others carry the responsibilities of freedom and the work and worry that accompany them—while we share only in the benefits—may be a very human impulse, but it is likely to be fatal."

This is not the way of Texas. We got where we are by doing it ourselves not by delegating to others, however well intentioned and however skilled, the work we must do for ourselves. And, in doing so, we preserved our freedom of choice—of friends, of representatives in the legislatures and in the Congress or organizations and institutions—professional, business, social, religious. I can't imagine the members of the Texas Pharmaceutical Association stepping out of the character of independence, the character of freedom, the character of the Lone Star State.

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BOGGS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FRIENDSHIP AND DUTY

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, because of the death of one of my closest and dearest friends in Orlando, Fla., I will not be able to be here for tomorrow's session, Thursday, July 29.

Mr. Speaker, in this day and times our congressional duties are necessarily more and more demanding on oneself and colleagues, but if we cannot stop

and pay respect to ones friends then I ask what are friends for?

I would like to take this time to express to my fellow colleagues my feeling on the three bills which we adopted rules on today, and which will be before us tomorrow.

H.R. 8856, the amendments of the Atomic Energy Act is a great program to control the atom to service humanity. This bill is a good and just piece of legislation and I would urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been a great honor to have handled the rule on H.R. 9026 to amend the Peace Corps Act, and to strengthen this very successful effort to enable our young people to extend their idealism to the needy people throughout the world. Truly this is one of the greatest tributes to our beloved President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, in considering H.R. 8310, the House is deliberating a piece of legislation which will have a profound influence on the lives of thousands of Americans. I was one of the authors of this legislation in the 88th Congress, and have continued my interest by introducing a similar bill to H.R. 8310 in this session.

The vocational rehabilitation program is one of the most constructive efforts this country has ever undertaken to create better lives for several millions of our citizens who are the victims of disabilities. As our programs of medical and surgical care have improved dramatically over the last 15 years—much of it the result of the kind of research which has been generously sponsored by the Federal Government—large numbers of our people have survived illness and injuries which would have been fatal in our earlier years. Yet we have not yet fully measured up to our obligation to see that these young people and these adults have a full opportunity to live usefully and with personal satisfaction despite their disabilities.

H.R. 8310 is a bill which will extend this kind of opportunity to a much larger proportion of our handicapped population. Its benefits will reach out to all parts of the United States, so that this is a bill which concerns all of us and the people we are here to represent.

I am proud to rise in support of this legislation. I introduced the administration bill, H.R. 7535, when the President sent his proposals to Congress earlier this year to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The bill, reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, carries out the administration's recommendations and adds several features which I am convinced will greatly improve this legislation. I am told that the Committee on Education and Labor reported this bill unanimously.

As a member of the Committee on Rules, I had the opportunity to consider this legislation at that point in the legislative process. H.R. 8310 was reported promptly by the Committee on Rules and I can assure the House that we had no difficulty whatever with this legislation.

The Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation has been soundly administered for these many years. Every time the Congress has been asked

July 28, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190004-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4163

Our Merchant Service Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, since the early days of our Republic, America has been a leader in merchant commerce. That position is gravely threatened today. The following remarks by Vice Admiral Deutermann, of the Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y., to the corps of cadets on June 2, 1965, succinctly states the present unfortunate condition of our merchant service, and I believe the admiral's remarks should be brought to the attention of all Members:

REMARKS BY VICE ADM. H. T. DEUTERMANN

For the past several years, I have been watching the units of your wonderful regiment participate in the Armed Forces Day Parade on Fifth Avenue. It has always been a most inspiring sight. Admiral McLintock knows this very well from the many high tributes and compliments paid him. Today it is a special honor and a proud moment for me to witness the whole resident regiment on dress parade.

Soon almost 200 of you will be graduated and headed for sea. This is always a very exciting and thrilling stage of your careers.

You have been well grounded in the technical aspects—in navigation, in the many seagoing phases of engineering, in metacentric heights, in damage control, electronics, thermodynamics, hydraulics, calculus, and all that goes to make up your degree, and, more important, a solid foundation for your professional careers.

It is regrettable, however, that the platform from which you would ply and project your profession, the U.S.-flag merchant marine, is not on as firm a foundation. From the high seas and, more important, from the minds of our American citizenry, as you have probably been studying and worrying about, our merchant flag seems to be disappearing. Worse than that, it is being replaced chiefly by that of the Soviet Union and her bloc countries.

Only a month ago, there were some 650 oceangoing ships on order and under construction for the Soviet Union while there were only 16 ships of similar size under construction for the United States. This has been a trend now for too many years and it can only lead to one sad conclusion: soon there will be practically no more; soon there will be too few of our ships at sea and altogether too many of theirs.

This is not just a matter of numbers of ships, their tonnage, their speed, nor their age. It has two other more important implications.

First, as you know, well over half of the world is just emerging into modern new political entities. These parts of the world, including most of Africa and a good part of Asia, are well stocked with precious raw materials and growing populations. Now the old trade routes must change to adapt to the new ones, new routes which are dictated by these new raw materials and emerging people. The real intent and long-range hope of the Soviet Union is to lay out these new trade routes, to capture these new countries for commerce and trade, and to replace us in their new world. The Soviets know that as a capitalist nation we cannot live nor long survive without this seapower, this commerce—this trade. And so they have done their homework well.

The other and more potentially dangerous implication is that these emerging people will orient their markets and industries to the Soviet Union, who will, therefore, deny them to us and, in the process, communize that part of the world. Cuba and Zanzibar are just a few sample specimens of Soviet successes already achieved.

And so gentlemen, as you go forth deeply imbued with the technical aspects of your profession, don't lose sight of the overriding and growing importance of the strategic aspects. You know well how apathetic our citizenry is about matters of the sea and how much lipservice and little attention is paid to seapower at the citizen level.

We need a live, apostolic group of burning young zealots to go forth and preach the gospel even as was commanded 2,000 years ago. Who else, but you, in this world, has more at stake in the business? Who else could be better qualified, and certainly better motivated and equipped, than this group of bright young men standing here before me? Go ye forth, therefore, and preach the doctrine, the gospel, the truths, the merits and, yes, the importance to our salvation: seapower.

Summertime in New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the best known and best liked writers in the city of New Orleans is Thomas Griffin.

Tommy writes a daily column for the New Orleans States-Item, entitled "Lagniappe." In this highly readable column, Tommy discusses people, places, and activities, but mostly Tommy writes about that wonderful subject, New Orleans.

In a recent column, Tommy pointed out that New Orleans is a great place to be in during the good old summertime.

I am including extracts from Tommy's column in the RECORD, and I hope my colleagues will heed this siren's song to come and visit, way down yonder in New Orleans:

SUMMER FESTIVAL

(By Thomas Griffin)

Summertime, and the livin' is lazy—in New Orleans.

If New York can advertise itself as a summer festival, why not New Orleans? It's hot. So what? It's hot everywhere. And I'll wager New Orleans is a more completely air-conditioned city than any other in these United States. All a tourist has to do to cool his brow while meandering around the French Quarter is to duck into any bar, restaurant, or shop for a moment.

But the French Quarter is not only our sole appeal. There's Lake Pontchartrain, a natural asset.

The river is something else. Here's an attraction that never fails to impress anyone viewing the Mississippi for the first time, 2,200 feet wide at the foot of Canal Street. Do you know enough water flows past that point to slake the thirst of the entire United States? We drink it after it has been purified in the city's reservoirs—while four Eastern States are at present on short rations for water. At this writing,

water is no longer served in New York restaurants unless requested.

A stroll along the docks can also be rewarding to a tourist. At the wharves one may hear Negroes chant melodious tunes as they unload boats. There's also the possibility of catching the fire tug *Deluge* in one of her firefighting demonstrations. It's capable of pumping thousands of gallons of water a minute out of the river in strong sure sprays to battle a rampaging blaze on a ship or dockside warehouse.

The Mississippi is also romantic. Its muddy, swirling waters have provided inspiration for songs, poems, novels, and plays. Young folks may still fall in love on moonlit dance excursions which take place on Friday and Saturday nights on the steamer *President*.

There's also a daylight sightseeing cruise which is the most informative way to grasp the immensity of the port. The steamer sails a distance of 15 miles up and down the river, 30 miles in all, affording a view of the ships in port, many of which fly foreign flags.

Tourists who have heard of bayous and have never seen one can be accommodated on either one of two smaller steel crafts, the *Voyager* or the *Mark Twain*. Each cruises through Bayou Barataria, the legendary hideout of the pirate Jean Lafitte and his cut-throat band of buccaneers. The novelty of passing through the Algiers locks—and the sight of fishermen and trappers' ramshackle homes along the banks of the bayou also afford experiences one may not find in other cities.

Entertainment? Perhaps nothing on the scale of the Dallas or St. Louis light opera seasons, but we do have the summer "pops" on weekends, featuring name entertainers from mid-June through July. (Marguerite Piazza, the opera and supper club star, is current attraction.) There's also jazz on Sunday afternoon served up by the New Orleans Jazz Club through August. And let's not forget the Blue Room where a good floor show is more the rule than the exception—and Leon Kelner plays the sort of music one can dance to.

Need I add the variety available on Bourbon Street, where talent is not an unknown quality any more? Pete Fountain's, Al Hirt's, the 809 Club, the 544 Club, Pat O'Brien's, the Famous Door, the Paddock Club, Preservation Hall, Dixieland Hall, are all worth a visit.

Visitors may dine al fresco in the open air at Commander's, Broussard's, and the Court of Two Sisters; or drink mint juleps in the beautiful patios of Brennan's and Pat O'Brien's. And food? Well, that's what we're famous for.

Yep, we've got a lot to sell New Orleans as a summer festival.

Tribute to Secretary of the Air Force
Eugene Zuckert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this country is indeed fortunate in having many dedicated and able people who are willing to devote their careers to Government service. It takes a great amount of human talent in all branches and at every level of administration to operate our democratic system of government.

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190004-5

A4164

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 28, 1965

I would like to join in commending the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert who will soon retire from his position as Secretary of the Air Force after a long and distinguished record as its civilian leader. He is the seventh Secretary of the Air Force and has held that position for over 4 years, a longer tenure than any of his predecessors.

But his Government service goes back much farther. He has served in the executive branch under our last five presidents, starting as an attorney with the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1937.

Three years later he joined the faculty of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration where one of his fellow professors was Robert McNamara. During his academic career Mr. Zuckert became assistant dean and did his first work with the Air Force as a consultant and teacher in statistical controls.

Since then Mr. Zuckert has compiled an impressive record of public service, providing that rare combination of a doer and a thinker, the practical and the theoretical.

He was a special assistant to STUART SYMINGTON when the Air Force became a separate service, then becoming the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. He played an important role in organizing the Department of the Air Force.

In 1952 he became a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for 2 years. His service with the Air Force and the AEC made him an expert in nuclear weapons and atomic power. In 1956 he coauthored the book, "Atomic Energy for Your Business."

When he was selected for the job as Secretary of the Air Force in 1961 by President Kennedy, there was no one better qualified in experience or knowledge. He has done a superb job. He deserves the gratitude of the Nation and I wish him well in his future pursuits.

The London Sunday Express
**London Sunday Express Hails America's
 Action in Vietnam**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. KEN W. DYAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend our President on his remarks of today and his blueprint for the future of the Vietnam problem. His speech showed admirable restraint and that coupled with the remarks of our Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY last night testifies to our sincerity and our desire to seek peace but our determination to allow no further Communist encroachment. Consonant with the restraint used by the President in his remarks is the excellent editorial by the London Sunday Express supporting our policy in Vietnam. The editorial is entitled "The Gentle Giant," which I insert at this point:

THE GENTLE GIANT

Did you see the picture of that burned and wounded child being carried out of the bomb shambles in Saigon?

Cradled in a man's arms, he stares—wide eyed, rigid with fear—upon horrors utterly beyond his comprehension.

Just one of the victims of the latest act of Communist terrorism which killed or wounded over 100 people, Americans among them.

What a dirty, dirty war.

But let us never forget where responsibility for all its tragedy and heartbreak rests.

It does not rest with the Americans.

They are not the aggressors. They are simply combating aggression. There could be peace in Vietnam tomorrow were it not for the brutal insistence of the Chinese and North Vietnamese that the whole country must go Communist first.

There should be not only sympathy for the United States. There should be admiration too—for her exemplary restraint.

Here leftwing critics may call shrilly for the ending of American bombing raids on the North.

But the fact is that in Vietnam the United States is behaving like a gentle giant.

If she wished—using only conventional weapons—she could destroy Hanoi in hours, occupy all North Vietnam, and go on to crush China too.

America commands incomparable armed power. Her forbearance in using it should command the praise and respect of the whole free world.

I'm Just Not the Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, last night after the House adjourned, I sat down to write in detail my position on the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I would like to submit my statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my constituents and other interested parties will know my feelings on this highly controversial matter.

I have often heard the expression that an airline pilot really earns his pay about 3 minutes a month. As I sit here in my office alone tonight, I realize that tomorrow when I cast my vote on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act I will feel very much like that airline pilot.

I find that my problem tonight is not one of indecision on how to vote, but the fact that my conscience dictates to me that I must cast a vote that is contrary to the strong convictions of many of my personal friends, the majority of the members of my political party and even against the opinion of some members of my own staff. There is also no doubt in my mind that whatever I say in explanation of my vote will not be acceptable to a great many of these wonderful people.

For a reason that has eluded me for 6 years the subject of right to work has evoked passionate support and equally intense opposition. As a result, the facts will be lost in this strong field of emotion, and many good intentioned people will have serious doubts about the person they sent to Congress.

Despite this, however, those who agree or disagree are entitled to an explanation and I can say in all modesty that anyone who knows me well, will know that I always have a good reason for voting one

way or another. For that reason, let me try to explain why I shall vote for repeal of section 14(b).

In 1958 the subject of right-to-work laws in my State of Ohio was the No. 1 issue facing the voters. At that time, although I was not up for election for any office, I thoroughly studied the pros and cons of this issue, devoid of all emotional aspects. I came to the conclusion that a union cannot bargain for just its own members alone. It must give equal benefits and equal protection to all. If this were true, then it must logically follow that it is unfair to deny a union the right to seek a contract which requires all of those whom it protects to carry their fair share of the cost. Having reached this decision I informed representatives of local district 50 of the United Mine Workers and the local labor secretary in my home county of my feelings. This was many months before the issue came to a vote in Ohio and is today, I presume, still a matter of public record.

I never regretted this decision. I have often felt, however, that the final vote on this issue in Ohio would not have been so overwhelming against right to work if the people had been less passionate in their outlook. Against the pleading of Ray Bliss, a group of people, some of whom secretly desired to ruin the labor movement, fully committed the Republican Party to a subject that right fully belonged between employee and employer. The unions, on the other hand, fought back with all their might and I am sure that many a laboring man became wrongly convinced that the establishment of a right-to-work law meant the absolute end of union seniority. Both sides went too far.

When it became apparent that the repeal of a State's right to enact a so-called right-to-work law was to come before this Congress, I felt it was necessary to look at this issue from an entirely different approach. While Ohio has settled this issue once and for all, one must ask oneself the fundamental question, Did not Ohio have the right to decide? Should not other States? Is not States rights a major issue involved in this vote? For one who strongly believes in a political philosophy of States rights this became the predominate subject in my decision and I know I would vote for or against repeal mainly on this issue.

In arriving at my decision I can honestly say that I feel I have read as much testimony of the hearings, examined the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act as closely, and received the vast amount of literature available on this subject, as any other Member of the 89th Congress. Here was my conclusion.

The fundamental purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act was to establish a uniform, national policy in the area of labor-management relations. The law itself provides safeguards for employers against certain types of union activities, such as secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes and certain types of picketing. It outlaws the closed shop.

Along with this national law, the Landrum-Griffin Act applies national standards to outlaw hot cargo contracts, protects union funds against misuse, erects safeguards to insure fair elections